



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

764,681

PROPERTY OF THE

*University of
Michigan
Libraries*

1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS

820.3
779.
1860



549

WORKS
BY
RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.
DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

SERMONS PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER
ABBEY.
Octavo. 10s. 6d.

ON THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

In connexion with some recent Proposals for its Revision.
Second Edition, enlarged.
7s.

NOTES ON THE PARABLES.

Seventh Edition.
12s.

NOTES ON THE MIRACLES.

Sixth Edition.
12s.

SYNONYMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Fourth Edition.
5s.

FIVE SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

2s. 6d.

HULSEAN LECTURES.

Two Series. Cheaper Edition. 5s.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S EXPOSITION OF THE
SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

With an Essay on St. Augustine as an Intrepreter of Scripture.
Second Edition, revised and improved.
7s.

The Essay separately, 3s. 6d.

[Continued.]

Works by the Dean of Westminster.

ON THE STUDY OF WORDS.

Ninth Edition, enlarged.

4s.

A SELECT GLOSSARY OF ENGLISH WORDS

USED FORMERLY IN SENSES DIFFERENT FROM
THEIR PRESENT.

Second Edition.

4s.

ENGLISH, PAST AND PRESENT.

Fourth Edition.

4s.

PROVERBS AND THEIR LESSONS.

Fourth Edition.

3s.

JUSTIN MARTYR, AND OTHER POEM

Fourth Edition.

6s.

POEMS FROM EASTERN SOURCES, GE
VEVA, AND OTHER POEMS.

Second Edition.

5s. 6d.

ELEGIAC POEMS.

Third Edition.

2s. 6d.

CALDERON'S LIFE'S A DREAM
THE GREAT THEATRE OF THE WORLD

With an Essay on his Life and Genius.

4s. 6d.

LONDON: JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, W.

ON
SOME DEFICIENCIES
IN OUR
ENGLISH DICTIONARIES.

BEING
THE SUBSTANCE OF TWO PAPERS
READ BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

Nov. 5, AND Nov. 19, 1857,

BY
RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.
DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A LETTER TO THE AUTHOR FROM HERBERT COLERIDGE, ESQ.
ON THE PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS OF THE SOCIETY'S
NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

LONDON:

JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.

1860.

820.3

579.1

1860

LONDON:

SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

226
17

ON
SOME DEFICIENCIES IN OUR
ENGLISH DICTIONARIES.

THE course adopted by the Philological Society, in its session of 1856-1857, with a view of removing some of the imperfections, and supplying some of the deficiencies, of our English Dictionaries, is now known to many besides the members of the Society itself. Many, too, are aware of the general acceptance with which the scheme was received, as one at once practical and full of promise; of the large amount of co-operation which was freely tendered both by members of the Society and by others; so that, the horizon of those who had undertaken the scheme enlarging by degrees, it was finally resolved to publish, not a Supplement to existing Dictionaries, which it was felt would only imperfectly meet the necessities of the case, and would moreover be encumbered with inconveniences of its own, but an entirely new Dictionary; no patch upon old garments, but a new garment throughout. The little Essay which follows is the substance of two papers which were read before the Society, while the scheme was yet in its infancy. It has been for some time out of print; and is now republished with amendments and additions, and also with such alterations as the altered condition of things may require. I may be allowed, perhaps, to mention here what I mentioned on that former occasion—namely, that I have thought it right to abstain from employing any portion of those large materials already collected for the Dictionary,

partly as being unwilling even to seem to employ for a private end contributions made for a more public object; but with a further advantage; for I am thus able to show, that it needs no such combined effort of many to make palpable our deficiencies, however it may need this to remove them; but that any one who is not merely and altogether a guest and stranger in our earlier literature, has in his power to bring forward abundant evidence even from his single, and it may be slenderly furnished treasure-house, of the large omissions which it is desirable to supply.

The title which I give to this little Essay that I am about to read is as follows—*On some Deficiencies in our English Dictionaries*. It deals, that is, with some, and not with all their deficiencies. It leaves wholly aside the etymological aspect of our present Dictionaries, and treats only of the imperfect registration in them of the words of our language, and the imperfect use of our literature in the illustration of the words. The plan which I propose in the following pages to adopt will be this. Remembering the excellent maxim of the Schoolmen, *Generalia non pungunt*, I shall deal as little as possible with these generals, shall enter as much as I can into particulars in proof of my assertion. Such a course, indeed, will be attended with a certain inconvenience, which is this: the fact that the vocabulary of our Dictionaries is seriously deficient can only be shown by an accumulation of evidence, each several part of which is small and comparatively insignificant in itself; only deriving weight and importance from the circumstance that it is one of a multitude of like proofs; while yet it will be impossible within the limits of one paper, or even of two, to bring more than comparatively a very small portion of this evidence before you. Neither my limits, nor your patience, would admit of more. This inconvenience, however, I cannot avoid. Even as it is, I

fear I shall put your patience to the trial. Perhaps I shall make the smallest demands upon it at all consistent with my subject, by grouping the materials which I wish to present to you according to the following arrangement.

Our Dictionaries then appear to me deficient in the following points ; I do not say that there are not other matters likewise in which they fail, but to these I would desire at the present to direct your attention.

I. Obsolete words are incompletely registered ; some inserted, some not ; with no reasonable rule adduced for the omission of these, the insertion of those other.

II. Families or groups of words are often imperfect, some members of a family inserted, while others are omitted.

III. Much earlier examples of the employment of words oftentimes exist than any which are cited ; indicating that they were introduced at an earlier date into the language than these examples would imply. So, too, on the other hand, in the case of words now obsolete, much later examples might frequently be produced, marking their currency at a period after, and sometimes long after, that when we are left to suppose that they passed out of use.

IV. Important meanings and uses of words are passed over ; sometimes the later alone given, while the earlier, without which the history of words will be often maimed and incomplete, or even unintelligible, are unnoticed.

V. Comparatively little attention is paid to the distinguishing of synonymous words.

VI. Many passages in our literature are passed by, which might be usefully adduced in illustration of the first introduction, etymology, and meaning of words.

VII. And lastly, our Dictionaries err in redundancy as well as in defect, in the too much as well as the too little ; all of them inserting some things, and some of them many things, which have properly no claim to find room in their pages.

Such are the principal shortcomings which I find in

those books on which we must ever chiefly rely in seeking to obtain a knowledge of our native tongue. I must detain you one moment before I proceed to my proofs, and I will employ that moment in expressing my earnest trust that nothing which I shall say may even seem inconsistent with the highest respect, admiration, and honour, for the labourers, whether living or dead, in this field of English lexicography. It is comparatively easy to pick a hole here, or to detect a flaw there; to point out stones, it may be many stones, lying in the way, which ought to have been built up into the wall; but such edifices as our great English Dictionaries could only have been reared by enormous labour, patience, and skill: and the same somewhat close examination which detects these little blemishes, and discovers these omissions, which shows us, what we might have guessed before, namely, that they underlie the infirmity common to all other works of man's hands, does to a far greater extent make us conscious how vast the amount is of that labour, patience, and skill which they represent and embody.

To come, then, now to my proofs. And yet before these proofs can be considered to prove anything, I must ask you to be at one with me in regard of what the true *idea* of a Dictionary is, what it ought to include, and what to exclude. If we are not agreed in this, much that is adduced may seem beside the mark. I will state, then, very briefly what my idea of a Dictionary is, hoping to find that it is also yours; and if not, endeavouring to persuade you to make it yours, as that which on fuller deliberation alone commends itself to your minds.

A Dictionary, then, according to that idea of it which seems to me alone capable of being logically maintained, is an inventory of the language: much more indeed, but this primarily, and with this only at present we will deal. It is no task of the maker of it to select the *good* words of a language. If he fancies that it is so, and begins to pick

and choose, to leave this and to take that, he will at once go astray. The business which he has undertaken is to collect and arrange all the words, whether good or bad, whether they do or do not commend themselves to his judgment, which, with certain exceptions hereafter to be specified, those writing in the language have employed. He is an historian of it, not a critic. The *delectus verborum*, on which so much, on which nearly everything in style depends, is a matter with which *he* has no concern. There is a constant confusion here in men's minds. There are many who conceive of a Dictionary as though it had this function, to be a standard of the language; and the pretensions to be this which the French *Dictionary of the Academy* sets up, may have helped on this confusion. It is nothing of the kind. A special Dictionary may propose to itself to be such, to include only the words on which the compiler is willing to set the mark of his approval, as being fit, and in his judgment the only fit, to be employed by those who would write with purity and correctness. Of the probable worth of such a collection I express no opinion. Those who desire, are welcome to such a book: but for myself I will only say that I cannot understand how any writer with the smallest confidence in himself, the least measure of that vigour and vitality which would justify him in addressing his countrymen in written or spoken discourse at all, should consent in this matter to let one self-made dictator, or forty, determine for him what words he should use, and what he should forbear from using. At all events, a Dictionary of the English language such a work would not have the slightest pretence to be called. What sort of completeness, or what value, would a Greek lexicon possess, a *Scott and Liddell*, from whose pages all the words condemned by Phrynicus and the other Greek purists, and, so far as style is concerned, many of them justly condemned, had been dismissed? The lexicographer is making an inventory; that is his business; he may

think of this article which he inserts in his catalogue, that it had better be consigned to the lumber-room with all speed, or of the other, that it only met its deserts when it was so consigned long ago; but his task is to make his inventory complete. Where he counts words to be needless, affected, pedantic, ill put together, contrary to the genius of the language, there is no objection to his saying so; on the contrary, he may do real service in this way: but let their claim to belong to our book-language be the humblest, and he is bound to record them, to throw wide with an impartial hospitality his doors to them, as to all other. A Dictionary is an historical monument, the history of a nation contemplated from one point of view; and the wrong ways into which a language has wandered, or been disposed to wander, may be nearly as instructive as the right ones in which it has travelled: as much may be learned, or nearly as much, from its failures as from its successes, from its follies as from its wisdom.

The maker, for example, of an English Dictionary may not consider 'mulierosity,'¹ or 'subsannation,'² or 'coaxation,'³ or 'ludibundness,'⁴ or 'definition,'⁵ or 'septemfluous,'⁶ or 'medioxumous,'⁷ or 'mirificent,'⁸ or 'pal-

¹ "Both Gaspar Sanctus and he tax Antiochus for his *mulierosity* and excess in luxury."—H. MORE, *Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 2, c. 10, § 3.

² "Idolatry is as absolute a *subsannation* and vilification of God as malice could invent."—*Id. ib. b. 1, c. 5, § 11.*

³ "The importunate, harsh, and disharmonious *coaxations* of frogs."—*Id. ib. b. 1, c. 6, § 16.*

⁴ "That *ludibundness* of nature in her gamaieus and such like sportful and ludicrous productions."—*Id. ib. b. 1, c. 15, § 14.*

⁵ "The *definition* also of the infant's ears and nostrils with the spittle."—*Id. ib. b. 1, c. 18, § 7.*

⁶ "The main streams of this *septemfluous* river [the Nile]."—*Id. ib. b. 1, c. 16, § 11.*

⁷ "The whole order of the *medioxumous* or internuntial deities."—*Id. ib. b. 1, c. 12, § 6.*

⁸ "Enchantment Agrrippa defines to be nothing but the conveyance of a certain *mirificent* power into the thing enchanted."—*Id. ib. b. 1, c. 18, § 3.*

miferous,'¹ or 'opime,'² or a thousand other words of a similar character which might be adduced (I take all these from a single work of Henry More), to contribute much to the riches of the English tongue; yet has he not therefore any right to omit them, as all these which I have just adduced, with a thousand more of like kind, have been omitted from our Dictionaries.³ I will not urge that one or two in this list might be really serviceable ('mulierosity,' for instance, expresses what no other word in the language would do); but admitting them to be purely pedantic, that they would be quite intolerable in use, still they involve and illustrate an important fact in the history of our language,—the endeavour to latinize it to a far greater extent than has actually been done, the refusal on its part to adopt more than a certain number of these Latin candidates for admission into its ranks,—and, therefore, should not be omitted from the archives of the language. If, indeed, the makers of our Dictionaries had, by a like omission, put the same stamp of non-allowance upon *all* other words of this character, on all which to them seemed pedantic, inconsistent with the true genius of the language, threatening to throw too preponderating a weight into one of its scales, this course, although mistaken, would yet have been consistent. But they have not done so. They all include, and rightly, a

¹ "The *palmiferous* company triumphs, and the Heavenly Jerusalem is seen upon earth."—*Id. ib. b. 2, c. 6, § 18.*

² "Great and *opime* preferments and dignities."—*Id. ib. b. 2, c. 15, § 3.*

³ It may be objected to this statement, that two or three of those above quoted are found in Johnson or in Todd. They are so; 'coaxation,' for instance, which the latter defines as "the art of coaxing"! but they are there without examples of their use; and though I shall not often refer to such words, when I do I shall deal with them as words wholly wanting in our Dictionaries; for to me there is no difference between a word absent from a Dictionary, and a word there, but unsupported by an authority. Even if Webster's *Dictionary* were in other respects a better book, the almost total absence of illustrative quotations would deprive it of all value in my eyes.

multitude of such words. But admitting these, such, for instance, as 'fabulosity,' 'populosity,' 'nidorous,' 'ataraxy,' 'andabation,' 'prosopography,' 'exiconize,' 'diaphaneity,'—admitting these by the hundred, they had forfeited their right, were it only on the ground of consistency, to exclude such as I have just enumerated, not to say that the idea of a Dictionary demands their insertion. It is, let me once more repeat, for those who use a language to sift the bran from the flour, to reject that and retain this. They are to be the true *Della Cruscans*: this title of *furfuratores* is a usurpation when assumed by the makers of a Dictionary, and their assumption of it can only serve to show how far they are from having rightly apprehended the task which they have undertaken.

There is, moreover, a still graver complaint which we make against them. One of the most effectual means of reducing us to the condition of $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\beta\iota\omega\iota$, of bringing us to live only in the present, is to cut us off from all knowledge of the past. We can only live in the past, and draw an ennobling inspiration from it, through acquaintance, and indeed through more or less familiarity, with it. This familiarity is acquired in many ways. The study of history, of antiquities, of laws, of literature, all help to give it; but I know not whether the study of language is not the most potent means of all for planting us in the true past of our country; and of this it is proposed in great part to deprive us by those who would make our Dictionaries the representations merely of what the language now is, and not also of what it has been.

These preliminary observations made, I proceed to support by evidence in each case the several complaints which I have made.

I. In regard of obsolete words, our Dictionaries have no certain rule of admission or exclusion. But how, it may be asked, ought they to hold themselves in regard of these?

This question has been already implicitly answered in what was just laid down regarding the all-comprehensive character which belongs to them. There are some, indeed, who taking up a position a little different from theirs who would have them to contain only the standard words of the language, yet proceeding on the same inadequate view of their object and intention, count that they should aim at presenting the body of the language as now existing; this and no more; leaving to archaic glossaries the gathering in of words that are current no longer. But a little reflection will show how untenable is this position; how this rule, consistently followed out, would deprive a Dictionary of a large part of its usefulness. Surely if I am reading Swift, and come on the word 'to brangle,' or light upon 'druggerman' in Pope, I ought to be able to find them in my Dictionary. Yes, it will perhaps be conceded, we will admit the few archaic words which are met with in writers so recent as Pope and Swift. But then if I find 'palliard' or 'mazer' in Dryden, must I be content to be ignorant of their meaning, unless besides my English Dictionary, I have another of the obsolete English tongue? Dryden's few archaisms, it is allowed, should find place. But I plead then, that in reading Jeremy Taylor I come upon 'dorter,' 'spagyrical,' and other words, hard to be understood: surely I may fairly demand that my Dictionary shall help me over any verbal difficulties which I may find in Taylor; and in this way I travel back to Shakespeare, to Spenser, to Gascoigne, to Hawes, to Chaucer, Wiclf, and at length to Piers Ploughman, Robert of Gloucester, or whatever other work is taken as the earliest in our tongue. It is quite impossible with any consistency to make a stand anywhere, or to admit any words now obsolete without including, or at least attempting to include, all.

What I complain of in our Dictionaries is that they do not accept this necessity, and in its full extent. They all undertake to give the archaisms of the language; and thus

those which I have just instanced are all to be found in them ; but they all undertake this with certain reservations and exceptions. “ Obsolete words,” says Johnson, “ are admitted when they are found in authors not obsolete, or when they have any force or beauty that may deserve revival.” I will not pause here to inquire what a lexicographer has to do with the question whether a word deserves revival or not ; but rather call your attention to the fact that Johnson does not even observe his own rule of comprehension, imperfect and inadequate as that is. When the words omitted may be counted by hundreds, I suppose by thousands, it seems absurd, almost a weakening of one’s case, to quote three or four, which yet is all that I can undertake to do. I have no choice, however, but to cite these. ‘ Grimsire,’ or ‘ grimsir,’ I meet everywhere in our old authors, in Massinger, in Burton, in Holland,¹ in twenty more, some of them certainly authors not obsolete, but he has not found place for it ; nor yet Richardson. This word, it may be pleaded, presents no great difficulty, though this would be no excuse for its omission ; but here is ‘ hickscorner,’ of which the meaning is anything but obvious : (the ‘ hickscorner’ is the loose ribald scoffer at sacred things) ; this word also, of continual recurrence in our old authors,² might be sought for vainly in our Dictionaries. Most readers, I am inclined to think, would be at a loss if they met the word ‘ titivillars,’³ which yet they might meet in Foxe and Stubs ; but beyond a slight notice, in so far as it

¹ “ Even Tiberius Cæsar, who otherwise was known for a *grimsir*, and the most unsociable and melancholic man in the world, required in that manner to be salved and wished well unto, whosoever he sneezed.”—*Pliny*, vol. ii., p. 297.

² “ What is more common in our days than, when such *hickscorners* will be merry at their drunken banquets, to fall in talk of some one minister or other?”—*PILKINGTON, Exposition on Nehemiah*, c. 2. “ A professed jester, a *hickscorner*, a scoffmaster.”—*G. HARVEY, Fierce’s Supererogation, Archaica*, p. 86.

³ “ Satan, the author and sower of discord, stirred up his instru-

goes, a correct one, in Wright's *Glossary*, no information about the word, no mention of it ever is to be found in Dictionary or glossary.¹ If in Milton's *Defence of the People of England* Salmasius is called "an inconsiderable fellow and a *jackstraw*,"² why should I not know what a 'jackstraw' is, without recurring to some archaic glossary for this knowledge? They indeed would not help me here, for the word is in none of them. Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* is a work "not obsolete," and one I trust which never will be; but I looked in vain in Johnson and in every other Dictionary and glossary for an explanation of 'shewel'³ (it means scarecrow), till Mr. Herbert Coleridge gave it in his *Glossarial Index*, with a reference to an early metrical romance, in which it occurs.

Still less satisfactory is Richardson's rule of admission and exclusion. "Obsolete words," he says, "have been diligently sought for, and all such, but no other, as could contribute any aid to the investigations of etymology, are diligently preserved." But why those only which would "contribute aid to the investigations of etymology?" why not those also which should enable us to measure in its length and breadth the intellectual territory which our English language *has* occupied as well as that

ments (certain Frenchmen), *titivillars* and makebates, about the king, which ceased not, in carping and depraving the nobles, to inflame the king's hatred and grudge against them."—FOXE, *Book of Martyrs*, Anno 1312; cf. STUBS, *Anatomy of Abuses*, p. 73.

¹ The demon 'titivillus' was one who picked up all the words of the mass-service, which the priests either omitted or mispronounced, and carried them off to hell. The later meanings of makebate, mis-chief-maker, are easily to be deduced from this.

² *Preface to the Defence*. A reference to Milton's original, where "stramineus eques" are the words, throws abundant light on the meaning of 'jackstraw.'

³ "So are these bugbears of opinion brought by great clerks into the world, to serve as *shewels* to keep them from those faults whereto else the vanity of the world, and weakness of senses might pull them."—Sir P. SIDNEY, *Arcadia*, 1674, p. 263.

which it occupies now, to form some estimate of its wonderful riches, as in other ways, so also by a contemplation of the enormous losses which it has endured without being seriously impoverished thereby? Why not preserve all those obsolete words which are necessary to enable the student to read his English classics with comfort and with profit? In carrying out his scheme he has often omitted, and not without loss, archaic words which Johnson or Todd has inserted. Thus I observe 'lurry' (a word occurring in Milton and Henry More), 'privado' (in Fuller and Jeremy Taylor), 'powldron' (in Ralegh), 'chōkepear' (in Rogers), and two I just noticed, 'druggerman' and 'palliard,' duly registered and explained in their pages, but altogether omitted in his.

Sometimes the word thus omitted is very curious. Thus no one of our Dictionaries, and I may say the same of our glossaries, contains the word 'umstroke;' which is yet most noteworthy, being, as it is, the sole survivor of its kind. For while there is abundant evidence that our early English derived largely from the Anglo-Saxon the use of the preposition 'um' or 'umbe' (= *āμf*) in composition, (thus 'umgang,' 'umhappe,' 'umbeset,' 'umgripe,' 'umklip,' 'umlap,' and many more, for which see Halliwell), no single word with this prefix, excepting only this one, has lived on into our later English; which yet the authors of our Dictionaries, as I have said, have not observed, or, observing, have not cared to register. I incline to think they did not observe it; for while most of Fuller's other works have been diligently used by our lexicographers, his *Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, one of his most curious and most characteristic, and in which 'umstroke' twice occurs,¹ has been, as far as my experience reaches, entirely overlooked by them.

¹ "Such towns as stand (as one may say) on tiptoes, on the very *umstroke*, or on any part of the utmost line of any map, (unresolved in

Not less curious from the other extreme of the language are the Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, words, which it has been endeavoured to transplant without alteration into English, but which have refused to take root here; a record of the attempt to transplant which ought not the less to be preserved, while yet often it has not been. Thus Holland sought to introduce Aristotle's *κιμβίξ*,¹ though certainly our early English was rich enough in words to express what is exprest by this, so rich that we have let drop more than half of them—‘snudge,’ ‘curmudgeon,’ ‘chuff,’ ‘gripe,’ (not in our Dictionaries in this sense, but so used by Burton),² ‘pinchpenny,’ ‘clutchfist,’ ‘penifather,’ ‘nip-farthing,’ ‘huddle’ (not in our Dictionaries in this sense, but so used by Lyly³), and many more. For Latin words, ‘ardelio’⁴ figures in Burton, ‘æmulus,’⁵ in Drayton, and in Andrews ‘rex’ in the popular phrase, “to play *rex6 or to play the tyrant, but none of these in our Dictionaries. Sylvester, whose works, by the way, are a mine as yet very*

a manner to stay out or come in), are not to be presumed placed according to exactness, but only signify them there or thereabouts.”—Pt. 1, b. 1, c. 14; cf. pt. 2, b. 5, c. 20.

¹ “He that calleth a liberal man, wellknown to spend magnificently, a base mechanical *kumbix* and a pinching penifather, ministereth matter of good sport and laughter to the party whom he seemeth so to challenge or menace.”—*Plutarch*, p. 665.

² “Let him be a bawd, a *gripe*, an usurer, a villain.”—*Anatomy of Melancholy*, 1, 2, 4, 6.

³ “This old miser asking of Aristippus what he would take to teach and bring up his son, answered, ‘A thousand groats.’ ‘A thousand groats! God shield!’ answered this old *huddle*.”—*Euphues and his Ephabuſs*.

⁴ “Striving to get that which we had better be without, *ardelios*, busy bodies as we are.”—*Anatomy of Melancholy*, pt. 1, 2, 4, 7.

⁵ “As this brave warrior was, so no less dear to us
The rival of his fame, his only *æmulus*.”

Polyolbion, Song 18.

⁶ “As helpers of your joy, not to domineer and play *rex*.”—*ROGERS, Naaman the Syrian*, p. 217.

inadequately wrought for lexicographical purposes, employs the Italian 'farfalla'¹ for butterfly.

Sometimes the word is one capable of doing good service still. Such to my mind is the verb 'to cankerfret,'² and another, 'to witwanton,'³ such 'rootfast, and 'rootfastness,'⁴ such a 'neednot'⁵ (the word is, I believe, still in use among the Quakers) to express such a superfluity as we might well do without. A 'woodkern' for a forest-haunting bandit, is a word expressive enough to deserve commemoration, if expressiveness is to constitute the right of admission.⁶

Let me observe here, and before quitting this important branch of the subject, that *provincial* or *local* words stand, so far as my single judgment goes, for I pledge no one else, on quite a different footing from *obsolete*. I do not complain of their omission. In my judgment we should, on the contrary, have a right to complain if they were admitted, and it is an oversight that some of our Dictionaries occasionally find room for them, in their avowed character of provincial words; when indeed, *as such*, they

¹ "And, new *farfalla*, in her radiant shine,
Too bold, I burn these tender wings of mine."

The Magnificence.

² "If God break off the soul betimes from this sin, ere it have
cankerfretted the soul."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 103.

³ "Dangerous it is to *witwanton* it with the majesty of God."—
FULLER, *The Holy State*, b. 3, c. 2. The word is also a noun:
"All epicures, *witwantons*, atheists."

SYLVESTER, *Lacryma Lachrymarum*.

⁴ *State Papers*, vol. vi. p. 534.

⁵ "Divine Providence had so divided it that other lands should be at the cost and care to bear, dig out and refine, and Judgea the power and credit to use, expend, yea, neglect such glittering *neednots* to human happiness."—FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, b. 1, c. 3.

⁶ "The same hath been said to me (who have been forlaid and whose life hath been sought), which were more beseeming to speak to a *woodkern* or robber by the highway."—HOLLAND, *Livy*, p. 1065; cf. Somers' *Tracts*, vol. i. p. 586.

have no right to a place in a Dictionary of the English tongue. I have placed an emphasis on "*as such*;" for while this is so, it must never be forgotten that a word may be local or provincial now, which was once current over the whole land. There are many such, which belonging once to the written and spoken language of all England, and having free course through the land, have now fallen from their former state and dignity, have retreated to remoter districts, and there maintain an obscure existence still; citizens once, they are only provincials now. These properly find place in a Dictionary, not, however, in right of what they now are, but of what they once have been; not because they now survive in some single district, but because they once lived through the whole land. I regret the absence of a number of these from our Dictionaries, and will instance a few.

'Spong' is now a Suffolk, or, it may be, an East Anglian, word. Halliwell deals with it as thus provincial, and rightly describes it as "an irregular narrow and projecting part of a field," corresponding, therefore, very nearly to the 'sling,' 'slang,' or 'slinget,' of some of our Midland counties. Our Dictionaries know nothing of it; nor should they take note of it on the score of its present provincial existence; but they should on the ground that it once had free course in our literary English, being often used by Fuller.¹ Once more, take the verb 'to hazle.' Halliwell and Wright explain it rightly as "the first process in drying washed linen," and assign to it also East Anglia as the region where it is current; but it was once not East Anglian, but English, as a noble passage, of which I cite a few words, from a great but little-known divine, will prove.² Then,

¹ "The tribe of Judah with a narrow *spong* confined on the kingdom of Edom."—*A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. 2, b. 4, c. 2; and often.

² "Thou, who by that happy wind of thine didst *hazle* and dry up the forlorn dregs and slime of Noah's deluge, cause a new face of zeal

once more, the verb 'to flaitē,' signifying to scare, to terrify, and standing in the same relation to 'flit' that 'fugare' does to 'fugere'—this may be, as our glossaries tell us, a word of the North Country now; but it was a word of the whole country once, and as such should have found place not in our glossaries alone, but in our Dictionaries no less.¹ The same may be said of 'to flask' in the sense of to flutter,² and of 'bunch' in that of stroke or blow.³ 'To hopple' (the word is not in Richardson), Todd gives as a northern word, and without example. Supposing he was right in saying so, he had no business to give it at all; but he is not; for it is employed by Henry More.⁴ 'Roating,' an epithet applied to grass, and signifying coarse and rank, may be, and is, provincial now; but it was not so once; Pilkington uses it.⁵ 'Dozzled' our archaic glossaries assign to the Eastern Counties, and explain rightly as meaning stupid, heavy; but we should not have to seek it, or at least to find it, only in them; Bishop Hacket employs it.⁶ I

and grace to appear upon our age, drunken and soaked with ease and sensuality."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 886.

¹ "Desire God to *flayte* and gaster thee out of that lap and bosom, as Samson out of Dalilah's."—*Id. ib.* p. 877; cf. pp. 138, 453.

"Then Phœbus gathered up his steeds, that yet for fear did run
Like *flaighted* fiends."—GOLDING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 2.

² "In speaking these or other words as sturdy Boreas gan
To *flaske* his wings, with waving of the which he raised than
So great a gale that all the earth was blustered therewithal."

GOLDING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 6.

³ "It is said of Peter that the angel gave him a *bunch* to-side, and then his chains fell off."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 193.

⁴ "Superstitiously *hopped* [i. e. entangled] in the toils and nets of superfluous opinions."—*On Godliness*, b. 9, c. 7, § 8.

⁵ "The Good Shepherd will not let his sheep feed in hurtful and *roating* pastures, but will remove them to good feeding grounds."—*The Burning of Paul's*.

⁶ "In such a perplexity every man asks his fellow, What's best to be done? and being *dozzled* with fear, thinks every man wiser than himself."—*Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. 2, p. 142.

believe a corn-sieve is still called a 'try'¹ in some parts of England, a small enclosure a 'pingle,'² a pond a 'pulke,'³ a child's hands its 'dolls'⁴ (the word has nothing to do with 'doll'=puppet), the ornaments on the collar of a cart-horse, the hounces;⁵ but the words had once nothing local about them, that they should be relegated to these collections, and found only in them.

While I am thus dealing with obsolete words, and before leaving this part of my subject, let me say a word or two on what the Germans call *nebenformen* (we have no word which exactly answers to this, but might call them 'sub-forms'), and adduce a handful of these, in proof of the incompleteness with which they are given in our Dictionaries. It was once attempted to make an English word of 'analysis,' and to speak of the 'analyse':⁶ examples of this I have before me in Henry More, Hacket, Rogers; but our Dictionaries do not notice it. When 'big' was intended in the sense of proud, it often took the shape of 'bog.'⁷

¹ "They will not pass through the holes of the sieve, ruddle, or *try*, if they be narrow."—HOLLAND, *Plutarch*, p. 86.

² "The Academy, a little *pingle* or plot of ground, was the habitation of Plato, Xenocrates, and Polemon."—*Id. ib.* p. 275.

³ "It is easy for a woman to go to a pond or *pulke* standing near to her door (though the water be not so good) rather than to go to a fountain of living water further off."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 842.

⁴ "Alas, let these same silly souls that in my bosom stretch
Their little arms (by chance her babes their pretty *dolls* did retch)
To pity move you."—GOLDING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 6.

⁵ "The spokes were all of silver bright; the chrysolites and gems
That stood upon the collars, trace, and *hounces* in their hemis
Did cast a sheer and glimmering light."—*Id. ib.* b. 2.

⁶ "The *analyse* of it [a little tractate] may be spared, since it is in many hands."—HACKET, *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. 2, p. 104.

⁷ "The thought of this should cause the jollity of thy spirit to quail, and thy *bog* and bold heart to be abashed."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 18.

‘To clitch’¹ was current as well as ‘to clutch.’ ‘Flox’² was a variation of ‘flax’ as well as ‘flix;’ it was applied like ‘flix’ to the down of animals. Like almost all other words of the same kind, ‘stick,’ for instance, which varies with ‘stitch,’ ‘belk’ with ‘belch,’ so ‘prick’ appears often as ‘pritch;’³ ‘ruddle’⁴ existed as well as ‘riddle’ or ‘raddle.’ ‘To strinkle,’ another form of ‘to sprinkle,’ is used by Henry More.⁵ ‘To wanze’ is the constant form in which ‘to wane’ occurs in some of our writers;⁶ our glossaries take notice of the word, characterizing it as a form of East Anglia, but it ought to find place in our Dictionaries as well.

II. Families of words in our Dictionaries are often incomplete, some members inserted, while others are omitted; the family being really larger and more widely spread than they leave us to suppose. Thus ‘awk,’ which survives in our ‘awkward,’ has not merely ‘awkly,’ but ‘awkness,’⁷ which none of them have found room for. Coleridge,

¹ “If any of them be athirst, he hath an earthen pot wherewith to clitch up water out of the running river.”—HOLLAND, *Xenophon's Cyropædia*, p. 4.

² “They dress it [their nest] all over with down feathers, or fine flox.”—*Id. Pliny*, pt. 1, p. 288.

³ “The least word uttered awry, the least conceit taken, or *pritch*, the breaking in of a cow into their grounds, yea, sheep or pigs, is enough to make suits, and they will be revenged.”—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 270.

⁴ “The holes of the sieve, *ruddle*, or *try*.”—HOLLAND, *Plutarch*, p. 86.

⁵ “Men whose brains were seasoned with some *strinklings* at least of madness and phrensy.”—*On Godliness*, l. 8, c. 14, § 11.

⁶ “Many bewrayed themselves to be time-servers, and *wanzed* away to nothing, as fast as ever they seemed to come forward.”—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*.

“His lively hue of white and red, his cheerfulness and strength,
And all the things that liked him did *wanze* away at length.”

—GOLDING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 3.

⁷ “Come, my child, I see thou fearest thou shalt never get anything;

I am inclined to believe, supposed he had formed upon ‘aloof’ the very serviceable word, ‘aloofness’;¹ but, though it has found its way into none of our Dictionaries, it also is two hundred years old.² ‘Nasute’ should have been completed with ‘nasuteness’;³ ‘exorable’ with ‘exorableness’;⁴ ‘elvish’ with ‘elvishness’;⁵ ‘fume’ and ‘fumish’ with ‘fumishness’;⁶ ‘bitch’ with ‘bitchery’;⁷ ‘rove’ and ‘rover’ with ‘roverie’;⁸ ‘verb’ and ‘verbal’ with ‘verbalist’;⁹ ‘conculcate,’ as its legitimate consequence, has ‘conculcation’;¹⁰

but look not thou at thine own *awkness*, look at the Lord’s ease.”—
ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 378.

¹ *Biographia Literaria*, vol. ii. p. 19, ed. 1847.

² “[God] stings him by unthankfulness of such as owe most love, by unfaithfulness and *aloofness* of such as have been greatest friends.”—*Naaman the Syrian*, p. 95.

³ “All which, to any man that has but a moderate *nasuteness*, cannot but import, that in the title of this sect that call themselves the Family of Love, there must be signified no other love than that which is merely natural or animal.”—H. MORE, *On Godliness*, b. 8, c. 2, § 2.

⁴ “A spirit of mildness, mercy, *exorableness*, and easiness to be entreated.”—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 55.

⁵ “The mere spirit that is in you lusts to envy, inclines to crossness, *elvishness*, and self-willedness of spirit.”—ROGERS, *Matrimonial Honour*, p. 195.

⁶ “Drive Thou out of us all *fumishness*, indignation and self-will.”—COVERDALE, *Fruitful Lessons* (Parker Soc. ed.), p. 284.

⁷ “The quip sat as unseemly in his mouth as for a whore to reprehend *bitchery*, or for an usurer to condemn simony.”—STANIHURST, *Description of Ireland*, p. 14; cf. NORTH, *Plutarch’s Lives*, p. 786.

⁸ “He laid the whole fault of all the *roverie* and piracy at sea upon Gentius, the king of the Illyrians.”—HOLLAND, *Livy*, p. 1086.

⁹ “The frothy discourses of empty *verbalists*.”—GELL, *Amendment of the English Translation of the Bible*, 1659, *Preface*.

“Yet not ashamed these *verbalists* still are,
From youth, till age or study dims their eyes,
To engage the grammar rules in civil war.”

—LORD BROOKE, *On Human Learning*.

¹⁰ “The *conculcation* of the outward Court of the Temple by the Gentiles.”—HENBY MORE, *Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 2, c. 12, § 1.

and 'co-inquinate' 'co-inquination.'¹ If 'cauponize' and 'cauponate' are worthy of a place, then so also 'cauponation,'² if 'latitant,' then 'latitation,'³ if 'larceny,' then 'larcination.'⁴ If 'quadripartite,' why not 'quadripartition,'⁵ if 'afterwit,' why not 'afterwitted,'⁶ as an epithet applied to those who deal in 'hadiwist' (had-I-wist) or wisdom which always arrives too late for the occasion—a more pregnant word than should be willingly lost sight of? If 'say' as equivalent to essay or proof, why not also 'sayman,'⁷ above all, having Bacon's authority for its use?

Again, if our Dictionaries find room, as they ought, for 'kex,' the old English name for hemlock, (or one of them rather, for only Richardson has it), why not also for 'kexy'?⁸ if they find place for 'fog' (I mean in the sense of rank grass), they should do so for 'foggy,'⁹ stuffed with

¹ "Fleeing from the *co-inquinations* of the world."—² *Pet.* ii. 20, (Rheims).

² "I shall now trace and expose their corruptions and *cauponations* of the Gospel."—*BENTLEY, Sermon upon Popery.*

³ "[Women] buried their children alive, lest their timorous outcries might bewray the place of their abode or *latitation*."—*JACKSON, A Treatise of the Divine Essence*, b. 6.

⁴ "Undoubtedly Judah's portion made many incisures and *larcinations* into the tribe of Simeon, hindering the entireness thereof."—*FULLER, A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, b. 5, c. 12.

⁵ "The *quadripartition* of the Greek Empire into four parts."—*Id.* *ib.* b. 2, c. 8, § 3.

⁶ "Our fashions of eating make us slothful and unlusty to labour and study, *afterwitted* (as we call it), incircumspect, inconsiderate, heady, rash."—*TYNDALE, Exposition of Matthew vi.*

⁷ "If your lordship in anything shall make me your *sayman*, I will be hurt before your lordship shall be hurt."—*Letter to the Earl of Buckingham.*

⁸ "The earth will grow more and more dry and sterile in succession of ages; whereby it will become more *kexy*, and lose of its solidity."—*H. MORE, On Godliness*, b. 6, c. 10, § 3; cf. *HAMMOND, The Seventh Sermon*, p. 513.

⁹ "Those who on a sudden grow rather *foggy* than fat by feeding on

this rank grass, as well. 'Heed' should not have the adjective 'heedful' only, but 'heedy'¹ as well; and 'bride' 'bridely,'² and 'droop' 'droopy,'³ and 'spendthrift' 'spendthriftly.'⁴ 'Hispid' should be completed with 'hispidity,'⁵ 'specious' with 'speciosity,'⁶ and though one may not be in love with 'sordidity,'⁷ yet, since Burton uses it, there is no ground for its omission. Why again 'maleficent,' and not also 'maleficence,'⁸ 'sanguinolent,' and not 'sanguinolency,'⁹ 'flowret,' and not 'flowretry,'¹⁰ 'fashion,' and not 'fashionist,'¹¹ 'prowl' and 'prowler,' without

sacrilegious morsels, do pine away by degrees, and die at last of incurable consumptions."—FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. I, b. 3, c. 12; cf. GOLDRING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 15:

¹ "Then green and void of strength and dark and *foggy* is the blade."

¹ "The citizens are very *heedy* and wary in all their public affairs."—STANHURST, *Description of Ireland*, p. 29; cf. SPENSER, *The Fairy Queen*, 5, 9, 13.

² "She, hating as a heinous crime the bond of *bridely* bed,
Did fold about her father's neck with fawning arms and said."

—GOLDRING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. I.

³ "Not merry, neither rid of fear as seemed by her cheer,
But yet a Queen, but yet of great god Dis the stately seer,
But yet of that same *droupie* realm the chief and sovereign peer."

—*Id. ib.* b. 5.

⁴ "Spendthriftly, unclean, and ruffianlike courses."—ROGERS, *Naa-man the Syrian*, p. 611.

⁵ "The *hispidity*, or hairiness of his skin."—H. MORE, *On Godliness*, b. 3, c. 6, § 5.

⁶ "So great a glory as all the *speciosities* of the world could not equalize."—*Id. ib.* b. 4, c. 12, § 4.

⁷ "Weary and ashamed of their own *sordidity* and manner of life."—BURTON, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, pt. 3, 2, 5, 3.

⁸ "The Bishop of Lincoln felt it, who fell into trouble, not for want of innocence, but for want of a parliament to keep him from *maleficence*."—HACKET, *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. 2, p. 85.

⁹ "That great red dragon with seven heads, so called from his *sanguinolency*."—H. MORE, *Mystery of Iniquity*, b. I, c. 8, § 4.

¹⁰ "Nor was all this *flowretry*, and other celature on the cedar, lost labour, because concealed."—FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. I, b. 3, c. 5.

¹¹ "We may conceive many of these ornaments were only temporary,

‘prowlery,’¹ ‘brim’ (in the sense of fierce, vehement), and not ‘brimly’;² ‘shrimp’ and not ‘shrimpy’;³ a good equivalent for dwarfish; ‘gingerly,’ that is, youngerly, and not ‘gingerness,’⁴ also?

Many verbs, such as ‘to ease,’ ‘to merit,’ ‘to toll,’ ‘to extirp,’ the older form of ‘to extirpate,’ have substantives formed on them—‘easer,’⁵ ‘meriter,’⁶ ‘toller,’ ‘extirper.’⁷ If it be urged that this is assumed of course, and that it therefore is superfluous to note them, I cannot assent to this explanation of their absence; and seeing that ‘forfeiter,’ ‘lapper,’ ‘thirster,’ and other little-used words of the same formation, are introduced, there is at least an inconcinnity in omitting these, as they have been omitted by tens and by hundreds.

Let me observe, while on this matter of faulty grouping, an error in the opposite extreme into which Richardson has fallen. ‘Rantism’ has nothing to do with ‘rant,’ ‘rent,’ and ‘ranter;’ it is not, as Johnson, who shares the error, explains it, “tenets of the wretches called ranters,” but simply the Greek *ραντισμός*, as is evident from the following passage in Bishop Andrews:—“We, but a handful to their heap, but a *rantism* to their *baptism*.⁸

But further, to work back from later formations to earlier, as used by the *fashionists* of that age.”—*Id. ib. pt. 2, 6, 4, § 7.* The word is in Richardson, but without an example.

¹ “Thirty-seven monopolies, with other sharking *prowlaries*, were decried in one parliament.”—HACKET, *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. 1, p. 51.

² “A man sees better, and discerns more *brimly* his colours.”—PUTTENHAM, *Art of Poetry*, p. 256.

³ “It cannot but a burden be, and that right great, to bear

With those same *shrimpy* arms of his Achilles’ mighty spear.”

—GOLDING, *Ovid’s Metamorphosis*, b. 13.

⁴ “It is a world to consider their coyness in gestures, . . . their *gingerness* in tripping on toes like young goats.”—STUBS, *The Anatomy of Abuses*, 1585, p. 42.

⁵ ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 40.

⁶ *Id. ib. p. 341.*

⁷ “Founders of states, lawgivers, *extirpers* of tyrants, fathers of the people, were honoured.”—BACON, *Of the Interpretation of Nature*.

⁸ *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, Serm. 2.

on which they are superinduced, and which they not merely pre-suppose as possible, but which actually exist. If 'sortilegious' is admitted, 'sortilege'¹ should be so as well; if 'pervicacious,' then 'pervicacy,'² which it assumes, and which has been in actual use, should not be left out, as it is by Richardson, and, which is the same thing, left without an example by Todd; 'garish' should not stand without 'gare,'³ nor 'soporos' and 'soporiferous,' without 'sopour.'⁴ 'Excarnification' stands in Todd (it is not in Richardson) without 'excarnificate,'⁵ from which it grew; in like manner we have 'dehonestation,' but not the verb 'to dehonestate,'⁶ which yet is employed by Jeremy Taylor; 'fellowfeeling,' but not the verb 'to fellowfeel,'⁷ 'compact,' but not the verb 'to compack,'⁸ of which it is the participle.

¹ "I have good hope that as the gods in favour have directed this *sortilegio*, so they will be present and propitious unto me."—HOLLAND, *Livy*, p. 1183.

² "The Independents at last, when they had refused with sufficient *pervicacy* to associate with the Presbyterians, did resolve to show their proper strength."—SYLVESTER, *Life of Richard Baxter*, p. 104.

³ "The multitude hastened in a fell and cruel *gare* to try the utmost hazard of battle."—HOLLAND, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, p. 412.

⁴ "In a *gare* and heat they will run, ride, and take any pains; but only so long as the pang holds."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 390.

⁵ "To awake the Christian world out of this deep *sopour* or lethargy."—H. MORE, *Mystery of Iniquity, Preface to the Second Part*.

⁶ "What [shall we say] to the racking and *excarnificating* their bodies, before this last punishment?"—*Id. ib. b. 2, c. 15.*

⁷ "The excellent and wise pains he took in this particular no man can *dehonestate* or reproach, but he that is not willing to confess that the Church of England is the best reformed Church in the world."—*Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Lord Primate*; cf. REYNOLDS, *Serm. 21*, Works, 1826, vol. v., p. 297.

⁸ "We should count her a very tender mother which should bear the pain twice, and *fellowfeel* the infant's strivings and wrestlings the second time, rather than want her child."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 339.

⁹ "But the art of man not only can *compack*
Features and forms that life and motion lack,
But also fill the air with painted shoals
Of flying creatures."—*SYLVESTER, Du Bartas. Sixth Day of the First Week.*

Again, why a word, and not the negative of that word, if such exists? Thus, why 'remission,' and not 'irremission;'¹ if 'evident,' why not also 'unevident;'² if 'wily,' why not 'unwily;'³ if 'give,' why not also 'ungive?';⁴ Or, once more, if 'parricide,' why not 'filicide?';⁵ If 'italianate,' why not 'spaniolize?';⁶

The designation of a female person, by changing 'er' into 'ess,' as 'flatterer,' 'flatteress,' or by the addition of 'ess,' as 'captain,' 'captainess,' was once much more common than it is now. The language is rapidly abdicating its rights in this matter. But these forms, though now many of them obsolete, are very indicative of the former wealth of the language, and have good claim to be registered. I have noted the following: 'sleeress (slay-eress),'⁷ 'buildress,'⁸ 'captainess,'⁹ 'flatteress,'¹⁰ 'in-

¹ "It is 'It shall not be forgiven; It is not, 'It cannot be forgiven.' It is an *irremission*; it is not an *irremissibleness*."—DONNE, *Sermon on Whitsunday*.

² "We conjecture at *unevident* things by that which is evident."—HACKET, *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. I, p. 197.

³ "Note but the plain husbandman or the *unwily* shoemaker."—FLORIO, *Montaigne's Essays*, p. 63.

⁴ "Truly it is a daring that deserves castigation in him, that he should throw dirt into the face of the Scripture, and deny the purity of the Greek text, before he will *ungive* any thing of his own groundless opinion."—LIGHTFOOT, *Commentary on the Acts*, ch. 6.

⁵ I have lost the reference, but the word occurs in HOLLAND.

⁶ "It was charged against the Earl of Bristol that he was wholly *spaniolized*, which could not be, unless he were a pensioner to that State."—HACKET, *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. I, p. 134.

⁷ "See wee no more of thee sone or douter up on earthe, thou *sleeresse* of the men."—Tobit, iii. 9, *Wiclid*.

⁸ "Sherah, the daughter of Ephraim the younger, the greatest *buildress* in the whole Bible."—FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. I, b. 2, c. 9.

⁹ " Dar'st thou counsel me
From my dear *captainess* to run away?"

—SIR P. SIDNEY, *Astrophel and Stella*, 88.

¹⁰ "Those women that in times past were called in Cypres, *Colacides*, i. e. *flatteresses*."—HOLLAND, *Plutarch*, p. 86.

trudress,¹ 'soveraintess,'² 'waggoness,'³ which have not so been.

A vast number of diminutives exist in the language, which have never found their way into our Dictionaries. Here are eight with a single termination: 'wormling,'⁴ 'loveling,'⁵ 'dwarfing,'⁶ 'streamling,' 'chasteling,'⁷ (= eunuch), 'timeling,'⁸ 'setling,'⁹ 'niceling.'¹⁰ Those, too, in 'ock' are very imperfectly catalogued.¹¹

¹ "Joash should recover his rightful throne from the unjust usurpation of Athaliah, an idolatrous *intrudress* thereto."—FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. 2, b. 3, c. 10.

² "O second honour of the lamps supernal,
Sure calendar of festivals eternal,
Sea's *soveraintess*, sleep-bringer, pilgrim's guide,
Peace-loving queen."

—SYLVESTER, *Du Bartas. Fourth Day of the First Week.*

³ "That she might serve for *waggoness*, she plucked the waggoner
back,
And up into his seat she mounts."

—CHAPMAN, *Homer's Iliad*, 5, 838, 9.

⁴ "O dusty *wormling*! dar'st thou strive and stand
With heaven's high Monarch? wilt thou (wretch) demand
Count of his deeds?"—*Id. The Imposture.*

⁵ "These frolic *lovelings* fraughted nests do make."—*Id. ib.*

⁶ "When the *dwarfing* did perceive me."—*Id. The Woodman's Bear*, 33. *Id. The Handicrafts.*

⁷ "It [Matthew xix.] entreateth of three kinds of *chastelings*."—BECON, *Contents of St. Matthew's Gospel.*

⁸ "Divers ministers are faint-hearted, and were, as it seemeth, but *timelings*."—*Id. The Supplication.*

⁹ "Such as be newly planted in the religion of Christ, and have taken no sure root in the same, are easily moved as young *setlings*."—*Id. Preface to Various Tracts.*

¹⁰ "But I would ask these *nicelings* one question, wherein if they can resolve me, then I will say, as they say, that scarfs are necessary, and not flags of pride."—STUBS, *The Anatomy of Abuses*, 1585, p. 42.

¹¹ There is an interesting article on these, and a collection, I should think, very nearly complete in the *Transactions of the Philological Society*, by Hewitt Key, Esq. Let me, however, add one which even he has past over, 'fistock,' the diminutive of fist,—

"Scarce able for to stay his *fistock* from the servant's face."

—GOLDING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 9.

Adjectives in 'en,' of the same formation as our still existent 'brazen,' 'earthen,' 'wheaten,' and noting, like the Greek adjectives in *ινος*, *ιάλινος*, 'glassen,' *ξύλινος*, 'wooden,' and the like, the stuff or material of which anything is made, have been far more numerous than our Dictionaries would imply. I can only adduce these five, 'flouren,'¹ 'eldern,'² 'tinnen,'³ 'yarnen,'⁴ 'wispen,'⁵ as having found no place in them; but am disposed to think many more will yet be found. It is only in the *Supplement* to Richardson that 'stonen' has for the first time made its appearance.

I must class under this rubric words which appear in our Dictionaries as subsisting only in one part of speech, when indeed they are two or more. Thus they have 'a snag,' but not 'to snag,'⁶—Todd, indeed, has the word, but as provincial, and giving no example of it. 'To snig,'⁷ (another form of the word) is entirely wanting. They have 'cranny' and 'crannied,' this last as an adjective, but not 'to cranny,'⁸ the participle of which it really is; 'ignoble,' but not, with Lord Bacon, 'to ignoble;'⁹ 'unactive,' but

¹ HERBERT COLEBRIDGE's *Glossary*, s. v.

² "Her chiefest pride is in the multitude of her suitors, and by them she gains; for one serves to draw on another, and with one at last she shoots out another, as boys do pellets in *eldern* guns."—SIR THOMAS OVERBURY, *Characters. An Ordinary Widow*.

³ "Thy *tinnen* chariot, shod with burning bosses,

Through twice six signs in twice six twelve months crosses."

—SYLVESTER, *Du Bartas. Fourth Day of the First Week.*

⁴ "A pair of *yarnen* stocks to keep the cold away."

—TURBEVILLE, *Letter out of Muscovy.*

⁵ "She hath already put on her *wispen* garland."—G. HARVEY, *Pierce's Supererogation, Archaica*, vol. ii. p. 149.

⁶ "Beware of *snagging* and snarling at God's secrets."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 14; cf. p. 291.

⁷ "Others are so dangerously worldly, *snigging* and biting, usurers, hard and oppressing."—*lb. id.* p. 211.

⁸ "The ground did *cranny* everywhere, and light did pierce to hell."

—GOLDING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 2.

⁹ "Ignobling many shores and points of land by shipwreck."—*A Discourse in praise of Queen Elizabeth.*

not 'to unactive.'¹ And then, reversing the case, we find in them 'to cancel,' but not 'a cancel,'² with Jeremy Taylor; 'to arrive,' but not 'an arrive';³ 'to strut,' and 'a strut,' while 'strut,'⁴ as an adjective, is wanting; so, too, is 'diary,'⁵ they have 'pleasant,' but not 'a pleasant'⁶ = a buffoon. The omissions in this kind are indeed innumerable.

I might have found a fitter opportunity for noticing, yet, rather than not notice at all, I will notice here that, while we have a vast company of energetic words, formed as 'telltale,' 'spitfire,' 'spendthrift,' still current among us, a far larger company has past out of use, and of these many remain to this day unnoted in our Dictionaries. I instance the following: 'getnothing,'⁷ 'stroygood,'⁸ 'spitpoison,'⁹

¹ "The fatness of their soil so stuck by their sides, it *unactiveid* them for foreign adventures."—FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, b. 2, c. 10.

² "Whose spirit desires no enlargement beyond the *cancels* of the body, till the state of separation calls it forth into a fair liberty."—*Life of Christ*, pt. 3, sect. 13, § 9.

³ "Whose forests, hills, and floods then longed for her *arrive*
From Lancashire."

—DRAYTON, *Polyolbion*, 28.

⁴ "He beginneth now to return with his belly *strut* and full."—HOLLAND, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, p. 213.

⁵ "The offer of a usurpation, though it was but as a *diary* ague."—BACON, *Letters*, 83.

⁶ "They bestow their silver on *courtesans*, *pleasants*, and flatterers."—HOLLAND, *Plutarch*, p. 169.

"Ridiculous jesters and *pleasants*."—*Id. ib.* p. 106.

⁷ "Every *getnothing* is a thief, and laziness is a 'stolen water'."—ADAMS, *The Devil's Banquet*, 1614, p. 76.

⁸ "To this same turret up they went, and there with sighs beheld
The oxen lying everywhere stark dead upon the field,
And eke the cruel *stroygood* with his bloody mouth and
hair."

—GOLDING, *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, b. 11.

⁹ "The scourge of society, a *spitpoison*, a viper."—SOUTH, *Sermons*, 1744, vol. x. p. 291.

‘swillbowl,’¹ ‘quenchcoal,’² ‘kindlecoal,’³ ‘kindlefir,’⁴ ‘pickpenny,’⁵ ‘nipfarthing,’⁶ ‘telltruth,’⁷ ‘makeshift,’⁸ as applied to a person, ‘bitesheep’⁹—a frequent title in Foxe given to a persecuting prelate—‘turntippet,’¹⁰ Richardson indeed has ‘to turn *tipper*,’ but not the noun.

III. Our Dictionaries do not always take sufficient care to mark the period of the rise of words, and, where they have set, of their setting. The length of life which belongs to different words is very different, some describing much larger arcs than others. There are those which rose with the first rise of the language, and which, we may confidently

¹ “Wantonness was never such a *swillbowl* of ribaldry.”—G. HARVEY, *Pierce's Supererogation, Archaica*, vol. ii. p. 141.

² It is used by the Puritan writers of a cold heartless professor in the things of God. “You are *quenchcoal*; no sparkle of grace can kindle upon your cold hearth.”—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 868.

³ “In these civil wars among saints Satan is the great *kindlecoal*.”—GUENALL, *The Christian in Complete Armour*, c. 2, § 3.

⁴ “In a word such a *kindlefir* sin is, that the flames it kindles fly not only from one neighbour's house to the other, but from one nation to another.”—*Ib. id. c. 25, § 4.*

⁵ “He [the Pope] sending out and dispersing these birds of his to be his hungry *pickpennies* throughout the whole pasturage of the empire.”—H. MORE, *Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 2, c. 9, § 8.

⁶ “I would thee not a *nipfarthing*,

 Nor yet a niggard have:

 Wilt thou, therefore, a drunkard be,

 A dingthrift and a knave?”

—DREANT, *The Satires of Horace, Sat. 1.*

⁷ “Caleb and Joshua, the only two *tell-troths*, endeavoured to undeceive and encourage the people.”—FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. 2, b. 4, c. 3.

⁸ “A rakehell, a *makeshift*, a scribbling fool.”—G. HARVEY, *Pierce's Supererogation, Archaica*, vol. ii. p. 2.

⁹ “Still keep that order with those bloodthirsty *bitesheeps* (bishops, I should say), that you have begun.”—*Letter of John Careless*, in FOXE'S *Book of Martyrs*.

¹⁰ “The priests, for the most part, were doublefaced, *turntippets*, and flatterers.”—CRANMER, *Confutation of Unwritten Verities*.

prophesy, will always remain above the horizon. Others, rising as early, have already sunk and disappeared. Others rising later, will yet, so far as we can judge, continue so long as it continues. Others, again, describe far lesser arcs than any of these; rising at a comparatively late period, they are already lost to our sight again; they lived only the life of some single man; or, it may be, used only once by him, their rising and their setting was at the same instant of time. But for all this, if their author and proposer was anything better than one of that rabble of scribblers who hang on the skirts of literature, doing their worst to profane and degrade it and language which is its vehicle, these words should not on this account the less find place among those archives of a language which it is the business of a Dictionary to preserve. Now these arcs, wider or narrower, which words describe, are well worthy of being measured, so far as they come within the scope of our vision; and our complaint is that adequate care has not been bestowed on this matter.

It is in every case desirable that the *first* authority for a word's use in the language which occurs should be adduced; that the moment of its entrance into it (that is, into the written language, for this only comes under our cognizance), the register of its birth, should thus be noted. Of course no Dictionary can accomplish this completely. Every lexicographer must be content to be often set right here, and to have it shown that earlier authority existed for a word than that which he assumed the earliest, till thus by repeated corrections something of an approach to complete accuracy in this matter is attained. But I doubt whether Johnson even so much as set this before him as an object desirable to be obtained. To a certain extent Todd evidently did so. Thus he has sometimes thought it worth his while expressly to note that authorities exist for a word earlier than any which Johnson has quoted; see for instance under the words, 'canaille,' 'financier,' 'privateer.'

Richardson has accomplished far more than either in this matter; though, strangely enough, he sometimes goes back from the vantage ground which his predecessors had already won, and satisfies himself with a later authority, when they had furnished him ready to hand with an earlier, and therefore a better. It cannot be brought as any charge against him, the first deliberate and consistent worker in this field, that he has left much in it for those who come after him to accomplish. For this is a work, as I have said, in which every one who engages will have for a long time to come to submit to innumerable corrections from those who succeed him.

To bring a few instances in proof,—one might suppose from Richardson that the word ‘scoundrel’ first came up in the eighteenth century, for the first authority which he gives for it is Swift; and in discussing its etymology he says, “the instances of its usage are so modern, that it seems difficult to connect it with an Anglo-Saxon origin.” Johnson has here the advantage of him; for he traces it back as far as Butler (*Hudibras*); but, in fact, ‘scoundrel’ is much older than this, being found not merely in Beaumont and Fletcher, and in Shakespeare (only once), but in Warner’s *Albion’s England*,¹ which was first published in 1586. Again, our Dictionaries would leave us to suppose that ‘committee’ arose about the period of our great Civil Wars; but from Holland’s *Livy*,² published in 1600, we may learn that it was current nearly half a century before. ‘Puberty’ does not make its first appearance in Bacon; Wiclif had used it long before.³ Of ‘economize’ Richardson observes, “the verb is now in common use,” implying that it is quite of modern coinage; and Todd speaks of it

¹ “That *scoundrel* or this counterfeit.”—B. 6, c. 31.

² “The *committees* of the captives had audience granted them in the senate-house by the Dictator.”—p. 468.

³ “The Lord witnesside betwixe thee and the wijf of thi *pubertee*.”—*Mal. ii. 14.*

as “of very recent usage;”—an entire mistake! it is as old as Milton, though the meaning of the word has been partially modified since his time.¹ ‘Apostate, or ‘apostata,’ which form of the word lasted long, did not first come in about the time of the Reformation, as all our Dictionaries might lead us to conclude, but is in fact as old as *Piers Ploughman*.²

But if it be thus desirable to note in every case, so far as this is possible, the first appearance of a word, then all those tokens which will sometimes cleave to words for awhile, and indicate their recent birth, ought also to be diligently noted. None are more important in this aspect than what one may fitly call “marks of imperfect naturalization.” Many words, as is familiar to us all, have only by degrees made themselves a home among us: denizens now, they were at first strangers and foreigners, and bore plainly on their fronts that they were so; the foreign termination which for a while they retained, but now have dropped, being commonly that which betrayed their alien character, their as yet imperfect adoption among us. It is clear that in no way is the date of a word’s incoming likely to be more effectually marked than by the marking and adducing of passages in which it still wears its foreign aspect; not to say that in other ways the history of a word is incomplete unless this be done. There has hitherto been comparatively little attention bestowed upon this point by any of our lexicographers, and, on the whole, less by Richardson than by his predecessors. They show us indeed, either one or all, how ‘pyramis’ and ‘pyramides’ went before ‘pyramid’ and ‘pyramids,’ ‘energia’ before

¹ “[Men] under tyranny and servitude, are wanting that power which is the root and source of all liberty, to dispose and *acqnomize* in the land which God has given them.”—*The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, ad finem.

² “And whoso passed that point
Was *apostata* in the ordre.”—Line 667, 8.

‘energy,’ ‘statua’ before ‘statue,’ ‘preludium’ before ‘prelude,’ ‘caricatura’ before ‘caricature;’ that ‘phantasma,’ ‘classis,’ ‘syntaxis,’ preceded ‘phantasm,’ ‘class,’ ‘syntax,’ with something more in the same kind; but a vast number of examples, passed over by them, still remains to be noticed. Of these I propose to adduce a few.

I will notice first some Greek immigrations, the time of whose incoming may in this way be pretty accurately noted; but which have either escaped the attention of our lexicographers, or have seemed to them unworthy of note. We should scarcely suspect ‘biography’ to be so recent as it is, were it not for the fact that Dryden continually uses ‘biographia.’¹ ‘Cynosura,’² employed by Hacket and Henry More, preceded ‘cynosure;’ ‘demagogi,’³ employed also by Hacket, went before ‘demagogues.’ Bearing out the novelty of this last word in the middle of the seventeenth century, let me just remind you that Milton in his *Eikovo-κλάστης* finds in the use of ‘demagogue’⁴ in the *Icon Basiliæ*,—“this goblin word,” as he calls it,—an argument that King Charles could not have been author of the work. ‘Chasma’⁵ is employed by Henry More and others, long

¹ “*Biographia*, or the history of particular men’s lives, comes next to be considered.”—*Life of Plutarch*.

² “The Countess of Buckingham was the *cynosura* that all the Papists steered by.”—*Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. I. p. 171; cf. H. MORE, *Immortality of the Soul*, b. 3, c. 17, § 7.

³ “Those noted *demagogi* were but hirelings, and triobulary rhetoricians.”—*Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. I. p. 175.

⁴ His words are so curious that, though quoted by Richardson and referred to by Todd, I will append them here:—“Setting aside the affrightment of this goblin word [demagogue], for the King, by his leave, cannot coin English as he could money to be current, and it is believed this wording was above his known style and orthography, and accuses the whole composure to be conscious of some other author.”—§ 4.

⁵ “Observe how handsomely and naturally that hideous and unproportionate *chasma* betwixt the predictions in the eleventh chapter of Daniel and the twelfth is in this way filled up with matters of weighty concernment.”—*Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 2, c. 10, § 8. “Between a

before 'chasm' was naturalized in our tongue. 'Dosis,' also, which he employs, and, I think, Bacon before him, preceded 'dose.'¹ 'Heros,'² too, is in constant use by him, and the plural 'heroës' is a trisyllable in Spenser. 'Idioma'³ occurs in the *Heliconia*, also in Drayton; 'parallelogrammon'⁴ in Holland, 'prototypon'⁵ in Jackson, 'hemistichion'⁶ in Bishop Andrews, 'extasis'⁷ in Burton, 'prosodia'⁸ in Drayton, 'zoophyton'⁹ in Henry More, 'epitheton'¹⁰ in Foxe.

I will now pass on to the Latin, dealing with all as such,

minister [of Christ] and Popery let there be a great *chasma*."—JEANES, *Abstinence from all Appearance of Evil*, p. 78. "Mount Olivet shall be parted into a great *chasma*, half eastward and half westward."—BROUGHTON, *A Reply to Dr. Bilson*, 1605, p. 13; cf. FULLER, *Church History*, b. 4, cent. 15, § 4.

¹ "A certain *dosis* of sanguine mixed with melancholy, is the spirit that usually inspires enthusiasts."—*A Brief Discourse of Enthusiasm*, sect. 21.

² "But to return to the description of this heavenly *heros*: a sharp-edged sword is said to go out of his mouth."—*Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 2, c. 14, § 6.

³ "Impartial judge of all save present state,
Truth's *idioma* of the things are past."

—*Heliconia*, vol. 3, p. 461.

⁴ "Suppose, then, there be a figure set down in form of a tile, called *parallelogrammon*, with right angles A, B, C, D."—*Plutarch*, p. 1036.

⁵ "No type in Scripture agrees better with the idea or *prototypon* than Sampson and John Baptist with our Saviour."—*Treatise of the Divine Essence*, b. 7.

⁶ "The charge is short, ye see, an *hemistichion*, but half a verse."—*Of the Conspiracy of the Gowries*, Serm. 3.

⁷ "In the same author is recorded Carolus Magnus' vision, an. 885, or *extasis*, wherein he saw heaven and hell."—*Anatomy of Melancholy*, pt. 3, § 4, 1. 2.

⁸ "Every grammarian in this land hath learned his *prosodia*, and already knows all this art of numbers."—*Apology for Rhyme*.

⁹ "A *zoophyton* may be rightly said to have a middle excellency betwixt an animal and a plant."—*Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 1, c. 9, § 3.

¹⁰ "Alter the *epithetons* [these 'epithetons' are 'horrible,' 'heretical,' 'damnable,' and the like, applied to the doctrines of the Reformation] and I will subscribe."—*Book of Martyrs, Second Examination of Julius Palmer*.

whose terminations are such, and which, Greek though they may be, have come *to us* by the Latin. 'Chylus'¹ is frequent in Bacon, and, if the examples of 'chyle' in our Dictionaries are the earliest, preceded it by at least half a century; 'antidotum' occurs in the *State Papers*,² 'adulter' for adulterer in Tyndale.³ Jackson uses 'abyssus';⁴ Andrews 'nardus';⁵ Holland 'heliotropium';⁶ North 'helleborum';⁷ Baxter and Henry More 'archiva';⁸ Worthington 'diatriba';⁹ Henry More 'folliculus';¹⁰ Jeremy Taylor 'expansum';¹¹ Fuller 'interstitium';¹² Reynolds 'vehicula';¹³ Chillingworth 'in-

¹ "Mists, smoke, vapours, *chylus* in the stomach."—*Natural History*, cent. ix. § 837.

² Vol. ii. p. 17; with date 1515.

³ "We receive unto our mass open sinners, the covetous, the extortioners, the *adulter*, the backbiter."—*Exp. of the First Ep. of St. John*, ch. 5.

⁴ "This is a depth, or *abyssus*, which may not be dived into."—*Commentaries on the Creed*, b. 11, c. 19, § 6.

⁵ "Yea, when the great and glorious acts of many monarchs shall be buried in silence, this poor box of *nardus* shall be matter of praise, and never die."—*The Third Sermon preached in Lent*.

⁶ "Two kinds there be of this *heliotropium* or turnsoll."—*Pliny*, vol. ii. p. 126.

⁷ "Attalus would plant and set physical herbs, as *helleborum*."—*Plutarch's Lives*, p. 739.

⁸ "The Christians were able to make good what they asserted by appealing to these records, kept in the Roman *archiva*."—H. MORE, *On Godliness*, b. 7, c. 12, § 2.

⁹ "That excellent *diatriba* upon St. Mark."—*Preface to Mede's Works*, p. 1.

¹⁰ "With her fore feet she works that *folliculus* or clue of silk above-named."—*Immortality of the Soul*, b. 3, c. 13.

¹¹ "The light of the world in the morning of creation was spread abroad like a curtain, and dwelt nowhere, but filled the *expansum* with a dissemination great as the unfoldings of the air's looser garment, or the wilder fringes of the fire."—*The Miracles of the Divine Mercy*; cf. HENRY MORE, *Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 1, c. 5, § 7.

¹² "There was an *interstitium* or distance of seventy years between the destruction of Solomon's and erection of Zorobabel's temple."—*A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. 1, b. 3, c. 6.

¹³ "Graces are like the waggons which Joseph sent to carry Jacob his

tervalla;¹ Hammond² and Henry More ‘machina;’³ the latter ‘mystagogus;’⁴ Culverwell ‘philtrum’⁵ and ‘vestigium;’⁶ North ‘ædilis;’⁷ Burton ‘spectrum;’⁸ Howe ‘vestibulum.’⁹ ‘Mummy,’ not a Latin word, but coming to us through the low Latin, appears for some time as ‘mummia,’ still wearing its Latin dress,¹⁰ and ‘pedantry,’ as ‘pedanteria,’ still wearing its Italian.¹¹

father; they are the *vehicula*, like Elijah’s chariot of fire, to transport the souls of believers unto Christ.”—*The Rich Man’s Charge*.

¹ “They conceive that if they should have the good fortune to be taken away in one of these *intervalla*, one of these sober moods, they should certainly be saved.”—*Nine Sermons*, p. 11.

² “Thus is art a *machina* or invention to furnish us with those abilities which Nature was a niggard in.”—*Works*, 1684, vol. iv., p. 627.

³ “Three such contextures shall one fatal day
Ruin at once, and the world’s *machina*,
Upheld so long, rush into atoms rent.”

—*On Godliness*, p. 42.

⁴ “That true interpreter, and great *mystagogus*, the Spirit of God Himself.”—*On Godliness*, b. 1, c. 2, § 2.

⁵ “Lucretius, a Roman of very eminent parts, which yet were much abated by a *philtrum* that was given him.”—*Light of Nature*, c. 17.

⁶ “His ways are in the deep; there is no *χρόνος* of them, nor the least print or *vestigium*, no tracing of a deity.”—*Spiritual Opticks*, p. 190.

⁷ “How cometh it to pass thou art thus rich, that thou dost sue to be *ædilis*?”—*Plutarch’s Lives*, p. 822.

⁸ “Lavater puts solitariness a main cause of such *spectrums* or apparitions.”—*Anatomy of Melancholy*, part 3, § 4, 1, 2.

⁹ “Nor could anything be more congruous than that having the keys of the celestial house of God, He should also have the keys of the terrestrial Bethel; which is but a sort of portal or *vestibulum* to the other.”—*Works*, London, 1832, p. 311.

¹⁰ “Your followers

Have swallowed you up like *mummia*, and being sick
Of such unnatural and horrid physic,
Vomit you up i’ th’ kennel.”

WEBSTER, *The White Devil*, Act 1, Sc. 1.

¹¹ “Nay, to so unbelieved a point he proceeded, as that no earthly thing bred such wonder to a prince as to be a good horseman. Skill of

Sometimes we can only tell by aid of the plural that the word was once regarded as foreign, though now it is so regarded no more. Thus 'phalaux' in the singular would tell us nothing, because this is the form which we have ultimately adopted; but the plural 'phalanges,'¹ instead of 'phalanxes,' leaves no doubt that he who employed it regarded the word as a Greek one still. 'Cento' in like manner is not indicative, but 'centones'² is; we may say the same of 'uri' and 'bisontes,'³ as compared with 'urus' and 'bison.' 'Idea,' 'specimen,' leave us doubtful, but not 'ideæ,'⁴ 'specimina.'⁵ 'Noctambulo,' which for a long time did the duty which 'somnambulist' does now, and was thoroughly naturalized in Arbuthnot's time, for he speaks of 'noctambuloes' (see Richardson), was plainly far from so being in Donne's, for whom the plural of it is 'noctambulones.'⁶ And to take example of a single Italian word; 'bravo,' being the form in which we have ultimately made this word our own, has no information for us; but where 'bravi,'⁷ and not 'bravoës,' appear as the plural, this marks it for him who so used it as Italian still.⁸

government was but a *pedenteria* in comparison."—SIR P. SIDNEY, *Defence of Poesy*.

¹ "Aforetime they had their battalions thick and close together, like the Macedonian *phalanges*."—HOLLAND, *Livy*, p. 286.

² " *Centones* are pieces of cloth of divers colours. . . . Metaphorically it is a poem patched out of other poems by ends of verses."—L. VIVES, *Augustine's City of God*, b. 17, c. 15, note.

³ " Neither had the Greeks any experience of those neat or buffles, called *uri* or *bisontes*."—HOLLAND, *Pliny*, pt. 2, p. 323.

⁴ " Socrates and Plato suppose that these *ideæ* be substances separate and distinct from matter."—*Id.*, *Plutarch*, p. 813.

⁵ " There constantly appeared in him such *specimina* of serious piety as were very comfortable to his parents."—HOWE'S *Works*, London, 1832, p. 324.

⁶ " They say that our *noctambulones*, men that walk in their sleep, will wake if they be called by their names."—*Sermon 46*, p. 467. In Henry More, *noctambuli*.—*Immortality of the Soul*, b. 2, c. 15.

⁷ " Hired fencers, called *bravi*."—MORISON, *Itinerary*, pt. 2, p. 25.

⁸ It is an omission in the opposite direction, when examples are given

It must at the same time be freely acknowledged that these are not perfectly infallible signs; that one writer will still deal with a word as a stranger, and lead us to suppose it so, while another, who wrote earlier, had already treated it as an homeling. Thus I find 'depositum'¹ used by more writers than one, and that a considerable time after Lord Bacon had employed 'deposit'; 'balsamum' in Jackson, though 'balsam' was already in Gower; 'commentum' in Henry More,² though his namesake Sir Thomas had long ago written 'comment,' 'prosodia' in South, with 'prosody' in Ben Jonson. Some, too, persisted in constantly using 'hostia,'³ long after 'host' was completely adopted in the language. 'Funambulo' makes its plural 'funambulones' in Wilkins, but 'funambuloes' in Bacon.

There are many other ways nearly related to this one, by which the date of a word's first appearance may be approximately gained; passages by aid of which we may pretty confidently affirm that, at the time they were written, the word was not in existence: these also I should desire to see gathered in. Thus if Sir Walter Raleigh speaks of "strange visions, which are also called *panici terrores*,"⁴ it is tolerably plain that the word 'panic' was not yet

of a word, as it still wears its foreign aspect, but none to mark its more complete naturalization among us. Thus Todd has an example of 'euripus,' used not of the strait between Greece and Eubœa, but applied to any other strait; none however of 'europe' employed in the same sense, which he might have given; as this: "On the other side there is an *europe* or arm of the sea."—HOLLAND, *Livy*, p. 1177. The word in neither form is in Richardson.

¹ "They [precious souls] are laid up as rich *depositum* in the hand of a Saviour."—CULVERWELL, *The Worth of Souls*; cf. ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian, To the Reader*.

² I suspect that it is only a witty *commentum* of the bishop's to make himself merry withal."—*Mystery of Iniquity*, b. 2, c. 5, § 8.

³ "Let them stay at home who are so zealous, as they will pull the *hostia* or sacrament out of the priest's hands."—MORISON, *Itinerary*, pt. 3, p. 32, and *passim*.

⁴ *History of the World*, b. 3, c. 5, § 8.

recognized when he wrote. Or take this quotation from Hacket's *Life of Archbishop Williams*:¹ "When wars broke out, they crept out of their crannies like the *cimici* in the houses of Italy, out of rotten bedsteads;"—can I doubt that the ugly English equivalent for 'cimici' had not yet obtained the name by which we know it now? The word indeed existed, but not our present appropriation of it.²

I meet in a book published in 1659,³ the following passage: "But all these owned a πολυθεῖσμός, a plurality of gods." I am not very rash in concluding that in 1659 'polytheism' had not yet found its way into the language; just as when Cicero writes εἰδωλον, ἀντίποδες, one is sure that 'idolum,' 'antipodes,' were not Latin yet. Again if I find 'acme' written in Greek characters, as I do in South, in Culverwell,⁴ and again in Phillips' excellent Preface to his *New World of Words*,⁵ if in addition to this I find it also explained, I have right to assume, that in the middle of the seventeenth century 'acme' was not yet naturalized in our tongue, although the time of its naturalization could not be far off. Other words, 'zoophyte,'⁶ 'axiom,'⁷ 'phe-

¹ Pt. 2, p. 182.

² We have further proof of this in such a passage as the following:—"Do not all as much and more wonder at God's rare workmanship in the ant, the poorest *bug* that creeps, as in the biggest elephant?"—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 74.

³ GELL, *Essay toward the Amendment of the English Translation of the Bible*, p. 336.

⁴ *The Light of Nature*, c. 4.

⁵ "The Latin language was judged not to have come to its ἀκμή, or flourishing height of elegance, until the age in which Cicero lived."—3rd ed. 1671.

⁶ "Another degree or rank of animate or living creatures there is, which the Grecians call ζωόφυτα."—JACKSON, *Christ's Everlasting Priesthood*, b. 10, c. 25, § 2.

⁷ "I mean the common principles of Christianity, and those ἀξιώματα which men use in the transactions of the ordinary occurrences of civil society."—J. TAYLOR, *The Liberty of Prophecying, Epistle Dedicatory*.

nomenon,'¹ 'criterion,' 'zoology,'² 'pathos,'³ 'chrysalis,'⁴ 'apotheosis,'⁵ 'ophthalmia,'⁶ 'metropolis,'⁷ 'prolegomena,'⁸ tell in the same way the same story. Or, once more, if I notice that at a certain epoch of the language not one but many writers employ 'individuum,'⁹ where we should speak of an 'individual,' I am justified in concluding that however, as an adjective, it may have been for some time current among us, it had not gained an independent existence, and a noun substantive's right to stand alone. Bacon's use of it as equivalent to 'atom' is merely technical. 'Skeleton,' which according to its etymology meant at first a *dried* mummy, was plainly a novelty in the language, when it was not settled in usage whether this neuter, or the masculine 'skeletos,'¹⁰ should be employed.

Neither ought a Dictionary to neglect what one may call

¹ "The miracles that enchanters do, they are but φαινόμενα, as we call them, they are only appearances and no more."—PRESTON, *Life Eternal*, London, 1634, p. 49.

² "Ζωολογία, or the History of Animals, by Dr. Schröder, London, 8vo."—This is the title of a book published in 1649.

³ "He had a moving πάθος and useful acrimony in his words."—SYLVESTER, *Funeral Sermon on Richard Baxter*, p. 14.

⁴ "Having past the state of a χρυσαλής, she [the silkworm] emerges after to a nearer tendency toward her purposed animal delineaments."—H. MORE, *Immortality of the Soul*, b. 3, c. 13.

⁵ "Dead heroes, whom they thought to be alive, after their ἀποθέωσις, or deification."—J. TAYLOR, *Of Godly Fear*, Serm. 9.

⁶ "We have ever since had an unhappy ὀφθαλμία, the soul hath been darkened and dim-sighted."—CULVERWELL, *Spiritual Opticks*, p. 183.

⁷ "Corinth, the famous μητρόπολις of Achaia."—*Id. The Schism*, p. 1.

⁸ "We have here the first glimpses of heaven, a prospect of Canaan, the προλεγόμενα of happiness, the initials of glory."—*Id. Spiritual Opticks*, p. 180.

⁹ "He cannot possibly mean that every *individuum* should give his suffrage."—*Ib. The Light of Nature*, c. 4.

¹⁰ "The dried *sceletos* or dead corpse of a man they used to carry about and show in a bier or coffin, at the table."—HOLLAND, *Plutarch*, p. 1294.

the *negative* assistances (they are often no more than hints), by a careful observation and judicious use of which it will very often be possible to fix a time when some word certainly did not as yet exist; while with the period of its non-existence in this way firmly established, and the field of inquiry thus effectually narrowed, there will be little difficulty in designating the exact time when it first showed itself in the language. For example, if I find a writer treating of a matter which presents every inducement to employ a certain word, and notwithstanding this, in no single instance employing it, I argue with more or less confidence that the word was not then in being. Thus if I read page after page in Holland's *Pliny*, where every temptation exists to employ the word 'sculptor,' for the author whom he is translating, is treating at great length, and one by one, of the famous sculptors of antiquity, while instead of this he constantly employs 'imager,' I gather not a certainty, but a very strong conviction, that 'sculptor,' at the time he wrote, was not in being;—as I am persuaded from other evidence it was not, nor indeed till the middle of the seventeenth century. Dryden is the first authority for it in our Dictionaries, though earlier than he might be adduced.

Again, if I find various devices resorted to by the writers at the beginning of that same century to express a tract of land almost surrounded by sea, so that they employ 'biland,'¹ 'demi-isle,' 'demi-island,'² (none of them in our Dictionaries,) I am able without much hesitation to affirm that 'peninsula' was not yet acknowledged to be English. The use of 'engastrimyth' makes the existence of ventriloquist at the same time, I will not say impossible, but cer-

¹ "From hence, a great way between, is that *biland*, or *demi-isle*, which the Sindi inhabit."—HOLLAND, *Annianus*, p. 200.

² "In the Red Sea there lieth a great *demi-island* named Cadara, so far out into the sea that it maketh a huge gulf under the wind."—*Id. Pliny*, pt. I, p. 235.

tainly improbable. If I read in Fuller of “that beast in Brasile which in fourteen days goes no further than a man may throw a stone, called therefore by the Spaniards *pigritia*,” I am pretty sure that the sloth had not yet found in English its name. All passages yielding hints of this kind should be sedulously watched for and preserved.

Yet here, too, it must be freely acknowledged that all such conclusions are open to error; as it must ever be, where the proofs are rather negative than positive. Thus, if frequently meeting with the word ‘counterpoison’ in the writings of Holland, which I have quoted so often (Richardson has it not, and Johnson only a late example of it), I should therefore conclude that ‘antidote’ did not yet exist; his own pages would be sufficient to convince me of error. The employment of that excellent Saxon phrase, ‘earshrift,’¹ by our early Reformers (it is not in our Dictionaries), might easily tempt us to believe that ‘auricular confession’ was of later invention, which, however, is by no means the case.

I have dwelt so long on the importance of noticing the rise of words, and the helps by which this may be done, that I must be very brief in respect of their setting. Yet, if a Dictionary should thus carefully indicate the moment of their first appearance above the horizon, it should, in case of those again withdrawn from our sight, note with the same diligence the moment of this disappearance; giving, that is, or endeavouring to give, in the case of each obsolete word, the latest instance of its employment; that so, as we hailed it in the cradle, we may also follow it, where dead, to the grave. When I say that this is desirable, that this is to be aimed at, it must of course be allowed at once that it is difficult, nay, impossible ever to affirm that we have adduced the *latest* instance of a word’s use. It is

¹ “The Papists’ lenten preparation of fourty days, *earshrift*.”—**CARTWRIGHT**, *Admonition*, c. 6, § 13.

always possible that a later may be produced. Still, that which may be regarded as the ideal perfection in this matter may be approached nearer and nearer; and as long as passages are producible later than the latest hitherto adduced, this ideal perfection is not approached as nearly as it might be.

Here, too, it may very well be a question whether Johnson set this before him at all; or, indeed, there can be no question that he did not. Neither has Todd concerned himself for the last use of words so much as for the first. Richardson has made it much more an object. Still in this matter also of watching and noting a word's final exit much remains to be accomplished. Thus 'gap-toothed,' or 'gat-toothed' is generally regarded as an $\alpha\piαξ λεγόμενον$ in Chaucer's *Wife of Bath*. At least, in all the many discussions on the word I have never seen the attempt made to fix its exact meaning by the citation and comparison of any later usages of the same; and such would be looked for in vain in our Dictionaries. Yet of these two are producible at once, belonging to the Elizabethan period, and both of them evidently quite independent of Chaucer. The first is from Golding's *Ovid*,¹ the second from Holland's *Pliny*,² where the word is exchanged for 'tut-mouthed,' an epithet given to those who have the lower jaw projecting beyond the upper; but the discussion of those two passages would lead me too far from my immediate purpose. Again, the latest example, indeed the only one, which Richardson gives of 'unease' (the word is not at all in Johnson), is from Chaucer. We might thus be led to conclude that 'unease' had vanished out of the language at a very early date; but it occurs as late as the middle of the seventeenth century,³ nearly three

¹ "Where seeking long for Famine, she the *gaptoothed* elf did spy,
Amid a barren stony field a ramping up the grass,
And chanking it."—B. 8.

² Part I, p. 366.

³ "What an *unease* it was to be troubled with the humming of so many gnats."—HACKET, *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. 2, p. 88.

centuries later than the date which he seems to assign to it. There is but one example of 'roper,' as equivalent to ropemaker, in Richardson (there is none in the other Dictionaries), and that is from *Piers Ploughman*; but the word is found in Holland.¹ Many other words he would leave us to conclude had a briefer existence than was actually the case. They have perished, it is true; but still they were not so short-lived as his quotations would imply. Out of a large number of such, I will only cite one or two. 'Unidle' (not in Todd), one might suppose from Richardson, had not outlived Chaucer: it was still good English in the time of Sidney.² Of 'unlusty' (in like manner not in Todd), no later authority occurs in Richardson than Gower: the word is employed by Tyndale and by Holland.³

There are some who perhaps may urge that all this is trivial and of little importance. I cannot agree with them. A word's birth may not be as important as a man's birth; but a biography which should omit to tell us when he was born whose life it professes to record, would not, in my mind, be a whit more incomplete in its kind than is the article in a lexicon which makes no attempt to fix, where there are any means for doing so, the date of a word's first appearance in the language. And as with birth, so also with death. When a word is extinct, not to note, where this is possible, the time of its extinction, seems in its measure as serious an omission as in the life of a man not to tell us the time, when that can be ascertained, when that life was ended.

IV. Our Dictionaries might note more accurately than they do, and illustrate by suitable quotations, the earlier

¹ "The *roper* which is painted in the temple of Pluto suffereth an ass behind him to gnaw and eat a rope as fast as he twisteth it."—*Plutarch's Morals*, p. 156.

² "For me, I do nature *unidle* know."—*Astrophel and Stella*, p. 26.

³ "He [the hippopotamus] waxeth *unlusty* and slow."—*Ammianus Marcellinus*, p. 213.

uses which words have now left behind them, the successive modifications of meaning through which they have passed. It is one of the primary demands which we make upon a Dictionary, that it should thus present us with the history of words, the significant phases of meaning through which they have travelled. It was a remark of Coleridge, that you might often learn more from the history of a word than from the history of a campaign; and this is true. Johnson is very faulty here; perhaps in nothing more so. Nothing is commoner with him than to take the latest meaning at which a word has arrived, the ultimate result, and to put this first and foremost, either quite over-passing, or placing last, the earlier uses which alone render the latter intelligible. The difficulties and confusions which are thus introduced into any attempt at an accurate and historical study of the language are scarcely capable of exaggeration. Turn, for instance, to the first word in which it was at all easy for him to go wrong, the word 'to abandon'; all the meanings which he gives, or which his citations bear out, are secondary or tertiary; the primary he does not once touch; and thus fails to put 'abandon' in any intelligible relation with 'bann,' 'bannum,' which lies at the foundation of it.

Richardson has bestowed far more attention on this part of his task than his predecessors, and not seldom the series of quotations by which he illustrates the successive phases of meaning through which a word has passed is singularly happy. Still, with all his superiority, I do not find him always careful in this matter to embody and preserve what his forerunners had won, sometimes going back from a point which they had already attained. Thus I find notices in Johnson or Todd, with good illustrative examples, of the following uses of words, which I look for vainly in him; 'feminine' in the sense of effeminate; 'thought' in that of anxiety¹ (important as clearing our Translators from a

¹ Let me add a still better example of this: "In five hundred years

charge of mistranslation at Matt. vi. 25, 27, often brought against them); 'vivacity' in that of longevity, 'misery' in that of stinginess, 'temperament' in that of temperamentum' or compromise, 'formality' in its strictest logical significance. But these and other omissions must not rob him of the honour of having here done much, although still leaving much to be accomplished by those who come after.

I will proceed by quotations, which, if few, shall yet be sufficient, to make good my assertions. I cannot then find that any of our Dictionaries take notice of 'metal' used in the sense of the Latin 'metallum' or mine, which is yet a favourite employment of the word with Jeremy Taylor.¹ 'Firmament,'² too, he uses, and Bacon as well, in the sense which *στρεπέωμα* has in profane Greek, in Aristotle's sense, not in that of the Septuagint. It is no uncommon sneer against our Translators that they must have been greatly addicted to the Church when they could make the town clerk of Ephesus speak of "robbing *churches*" (Acts xix. 37). But they who utter this should have known, though indeed our Dictionaries do not help them here, that 'church' is constantly used in early English for heathen temple. I suppose it occurs in Golding's translation of *Ovid's Metamorphoses* fifty times in this sense.³ Our Dictionaries do not notice 'sure'⁴ in the sense of affianced; nor 'clumsy'⁵

only two queens have died in childbirth. Queen Catharine Parr died rather of *thought*."—*Tracts during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, Somers' Tracts*, vol. 1, p. 172.

¹ "It was impossible to live without our king, but as slaves live, that is such who are civilly dead, and condemned to *metals*."—*Ductor Dubitantium, Epistle Ded.*

² "Custom is the sanction or the *firmament* of the law."—*Apples of Sodom*.

³ One may suffice from the first book:—

"Men, beasts, trees, corn, and with their gods were *churches* washed away."

⁴ "The King was *sure* to Dame Elizabeth Lucy, and her husband before God."—*SIR T. MORE, History of King Richard III.*

⁵ "The Carthaginians followed the enemies in chase as far as Trebia,

in its early sense of stiff with cold ; nor ‘deplored’¹ in the Latin sense of ‘deploratus,’ namely, given over by physicians ; nor ‘desired’² in the sense of regretted ; nor ‘penury’³ in that of penuriousness ; nor ‘chaos’ in that of yawning gulf ;⁴ nor ‘spinster’⁵ in that of woman of ill life, sent therefore, or liable to be sent, to the spinning house. None of them have noticed that ‘heroics’⁶ sometimes mean heroes, that a ‘whirlpool’⁷ is not the name merely of a *pool* which *whirls* ships, but also of a fish which

and there gave over, and returned to the camp so *clumsy* and frozen [*ita torpentes gelu in castra rediere*] as scarcely they felt the joy of their victory.”—HOLLAND, *Livy*, p. 425.

¹ “Physicians do make a kind of scruple and religion to stay with the patient after the disease is *deplored* ; whereas in my judgment they ought, both to acquire the skill, and to give the attendances for the facilitating and assuaging of the pains and agonies of death.”—BACON, *Advancement of Learning*, b. 2.

² “He [Jehoram] reigned in Jerusalem eight years, and departed without being *desired*.”—*2 Chron. xxi. 20, Authorized Version*.

“She shall be pleasant while she lives, and *desired* when she dies.”—J. TAYLOR, *The Marriage Ring*.

³ “God sometimes punishes one sin with another ; pride with adultery, drunkenness with murder, *penury* with oppression, irreligion with blasphemy.”—*Id. The Faith and Patience of the Saints*.

⁴ “And look, what other thing soever besides cometh within the *chaos* of this monster’s throat, be it beast, boat, or stone, down it goeth incontinently that foul great swallow of his.”—HOLLAND, *Plutarch’s Morals* ; cf. Luke xvi. 26 ; *Rheims Version*.

⁵ “Many would never be indicted *spinsters* were they spinsters, nor come to so public and shameful punishments, if painfully employed in that vocation.”—FULLEE, *Worthies of England, Kent* ; cf. BEAUMONT and FLETCHER, *The Prophetess*, Act 3, Sc. 1.

⁶ “Many other particular circumstances of his [Homer’s] gods assisting the ancient *heroics*, might justly breed offence to any serious reader.”—JACKSON, *The Eternal Truth of Scripture*, b. 1, c. 11.

⁷ “The Indian sea breedeth the most and the biggest fishes that are ; among which the whales, and *whirlpools* called *balænæ*, take up in length as much as four acres or arpens of land.”—HOLLAND, *Pliny*, p. 235.

“The ork, *whirlpool*, whale, or huffing *physeter*.”

—SYLVESTER, *Du Bartas, Fifth Day of the First Week*.

whirls pools. They are altogether astray about the meaning of 'lumber,' which is properly the 'Lombard's' or pawn-broker's shop,¹ and then the goods deposited there.²

V. Our Dictionaries pay comparatively little attention to the distinction of synonymous words. It would manifestly be desirable to see included in their pages all the best and aptest passages which serve to distinguish any word from the synonyms with which it is in danger of being confounded, either by felicitous opposition, or by avowed discrimination, and which assign to each the province which is properly its own. We expect to find in a Greek lexicon Aristotle's distinction between *εὐγενής* and *γενναῖος*,³ between *κόλασις* and *τιμωρία*,⁴ and the like. So, too, no good Latin Dictionary would omit Cicero's distinction between 'prudentia' and 'sapientia,'⁵ 'furor' and 'insania,'⁶ 'malitia' and 'vitiositas,'⁷ 'caritas' and 'amor,'⁸ 'anxietas' and 'angor.'⁹ And in like manner what a remarkable feature in the new German Dictionary now in course of publication by the two Grimms, are the frequent and laborious discussions on synonymous words, with illustrative quotations separating them off and discerning them from one another. They are in almost every case of singular interest; as for instance when they treat on the difference between 'Aar' and 'Adler,' 'Antlitz' and 'Angesicht,' 'Becher,' 'Glas' and 'Kehl,' 'Butter,' 'Schmalz' and 'Anke,' 'Degen' and 'Schwert.' But this subject is in our own Dictionaries seldom even touched upon, and still

¹ "They put up all the little plate they had in the *lumber*, which is pawning it, till the ships came."—LADY MURRAY, *Lives of George Baillie and Lady Grisell Baillie*.

² "And by an action falsely laid in trover,

The *lumber* for their proper goods recover."

—BUTLER, *Upon Critics*.

³ *Hist. Anim.* I, I, 14.

⁴ *Rhet.* I, 10.

⁵ *De Off.* I, 43.

⁶ *Tusc.* iii. 5. II.

⁷ *De N. D.* iii. 30.

⁸ *De Part. Or.* 25.

⁹ *Tusc.* 4, 12.

more rarely is it sufficiently handled. I may, indeed, be deceived, for this is a point more difficult to bring to the proof than other assertions which I have made; I can only speak my impression here, but certainly this impression is, that the quotations chosen for their bearing on this matter are few and scanty. This is the more to be regretted, as we are greatly deficient in a comprehensive work on English synonyms; the two best which we have, that of Taylor of Norwich, and that edited by Archbishop Whately, making no pretence to exhaust the subject.

Yet it would not be very difficult to bring together a large and instructive collection of materials bearing on this subject, and they might constitute a feature of no less interest in our Dictionaries, than a similar collection does in that of the Grimms. Coleridge is eminently rich in such passages, and would yield a large harvest of them to any one who would be at the pains to seek them. Thus what Dictionary would not be a gainer by the citation of those passages from him in which he distinguishes between 'analogy' and 'metaphor,'¹ 'form' and 'shape,' 'fanaticism' and 'enthusiasm,'² or, to take earlier examples, by that from Barrow, in which he draws the line of demarcation between 'detraction' and 'slander,' or again, that of South, in which he does the same for 'emulation' and 'envy.'³

What clearness of insight well selected quotations of the kind I ask, would give into the exact force and value of words, which being nearly equivalent, are continually in danger of being accounted to be wholly so; and bordering closely on one another, are liable to have their several limits confused. For instance, none of our Dictionaries trace clearly the line of demarcation between 'docile' and

¹ *Aids to Reflection*, p. 198. 1825.

² *Literary Remains*, vol. 2, p. 365.

³ *Sermons*, 1737, vol. 5, p. 403.

‘docible,’ treating them as merely convertible words; and so do most of the authors whom they quote as employing them. But take this brief passage from Hacket:¹ “Whom Nature hath made *docile*, it is injurious to prohibit him from learning anything that is *docible*;” and what possibility is there in any mind of confusing them any more, or of missing the fact that ‘*docile*’ is able *to learn*, and ‘*docible*’ able *to be learned*? Or take the words ‘*safe*’ and ‘*secure*,’ and adduce, under one or other of them, as fixing their distinction, this passage from Jeremy Taylor: “We cannot endure to be disturbed or awakened from our pleasing lethargy, for we care not to be *safe*, but to be *secure*; not to escape hell, but to live pleasantly;”² and how excellently would a quotation such as this bring out the distinction—namely, that in ‘*safe*’ we have the objective fact of freedom from peril expressed; in ‘*secure*’ the subjective feeling and belief, true or untrue, of the same.

And before leaving this subject of synonyms, let me further note how desirable it would be that all important passages should be cited, which discuss in any way a word’s relations to other words, not merely in its own language, but in any other. No Latin Dictionary would pass by Cicero’s observations on ‘*vultus*,’ and the superiority of it to any Greek corresponding word, in that it sets out the countenance as the index of the mind, which, he affirms, no Greek one does;³ nor those in which he traces a like superiority in ‘*divinatio*’ over *μαντική*,⁴ in ‘*convivium*’ over *συμπόσιον*;⁵ nor would fail to quote what he says of ‘*ineptus*,’ and the causes to which he traces, in such high Roman fashion, the absence of any corresponding word in the Greek.⁶ Many such passages, unregistered as yet, our English literature must possess.

¹ *Life of Archbishop Williams*, pt. 1, p. 28.

² *On Slander and Flattery*, Serm. 24.

³ *De Legg.* 1, 9, 27. ⁴ *De Divin.* 1, 1. ⁵ *De Senect.* 13.

⁶ *De Orat.* 2, 4, 17.

VI. Many passages are passed by which might be usefully adduced in illustration of the first introduction, etymology, and meaning of words. A good dictionary will mark itself by such happy quotations. There are passages for one cause or another so classical, in respect of certain words, that it would be a manifest defect if they were omitted; such, for instance, as that upon 'livery' in Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, given in both our Dictionaries. Indeed, very much in this kind has been brought together already, but much more remains to be done. He would be utterly unreasonable who should urge as a fault that all has not here been accomplished. The literature of our language is so vast, so far exceeding the compass of any one man's power to embrace it all, that innumerable precious quotations must escape the single-handed student; even when he inherits the labours of others, who, single-handed as himself, have wrought before him in this almost boundless field. Although, therefore, in no spirit of fault-finding, I may still say that I should fain see cited in our Dictionaries, and in a perfect one there would be cited, all such passages as the following:—

a. Passages which give an account of, or implicitly serve to mark, the first introduction of a word into the language, or first use of it in an entirely new sense. As no good Latin Dictionary would omit, under 'favor,' at least a reference to Quintilian's quotation from Cicero's *Letters*, marking the date of its first use, under 'unio' that from the elder Pliny,¹ which notes the exact moment at which it was first applied to pearls in which all the higher perfections of the pearl centred and met, so neither ought our Dictionaries to omit passages of a similar value. This from Heylin's *Animadversions on Fuller's Church History*,² marks the exact moment when 'plunder' entered into the language: "Plunder, both name and thing, was unknown in

¹ *Hist. Nat.* 9. 35, 56.

² P. 196.

England till the beginning of the war, and the war began not till Sept., An. 1642." Up to the middle of the seventeenth century our good writers use 'self-slaughter' (Shakespeare), 'self-homicide' (Jackson), 'self-murder,' never 'suicide.' The following ineffectual protest against the word marks pretty nearly the date of its introduction: "Nor less to be exploded is the word *suicide*, which may as well seem to participate of *sus* a sow, as of the pronoun *sui*."¹ In Evelyn's *Diary*² we have a notice that 'opera' is about to establish itself in our language, perhaps the first appearance of it therein; the quotation at any rate is earlier than any which our Dictionaries furnish: "Bernini, a Florentine sculptor, architect, and poet, a little while before my coming to the city gave a public *opera* (*for so they call shows of that kind*) wherein he painted the scenes, &c." So, too, more than one quotation would indicate a time when 'umbrella,' word and thing, must have been alike unknown, or nearly unknown, in England.³

The word 'negoce,' which by the way is not in any of our Dictionaries, as neither is 'negotious,'⁴ nor 'negotious-

¹ PHILLIPS, *New World of Words*, 3rd ed. 1671, *Preface*. It is plain that even then it was very partially recognized; for in the collected edition of Jackson's works, published two years later, I observe 'suicidium' used on two or three occasions in the *Index*, and at the heading of chapters—never, of course, in Jackson's own text, which would give it a very much earlier date: but this passage from Phillips is sufficient to prove that Génin (*Recréations Philologiques*, t. 1, p. 194) is in error when he affirms that the word 'suicide' was invented by a Frenchman, the Abbé Desfontaines, in 1738; and that we did not possess it till we derived it from the French.

² *Rome, Nov. 19, 1644.*

³ "In Italy they carry *umbrels* or things like a little canopy over their heads; but a learned physician told me that the use of them was dangerous, because they gather the heat into a pyramidal form, and then cast it down perpendicularly on the head."—MOBISON, *Itinerary*, pt. 3, p. 21.

⁴ "Some servants, if they be set about what they like, are very nimble and *negotious*."—ROGERS, *Naaman the Syrian*, p. 309.

ness,¹ has failed to gain a footing in the language; yet, consistently with the principles everywhere laid down in these pages, I should desire to see it noted, and with it Bentley's defence of it against the cavils of Boyle. It is a curious passage: "The words in my book which he excepts against are *commentitious*, *repudiate*, *concede*, *aliene*, *vernacular*, *timid*, *negoce*, *putid*, and *idiom*; every one of which were in print before I used them, and most of them before I was born. Why may we not say *negoce* from *negotium*, as well as *commerce* from *commercium*, and *palace* from *palatium*? Has not the French nation been beforehand with us in espousing it? and have not we *negotiate* and *negotiation*, words which grew upon the same root, in the commonest use?"²

β. Again, I would fain see cited the chief passages in our literature, as many as occur, which consciously discuss, or unconsciously reveal, the etymology of a word, the *rationale* of a name. Here, too, there is a gleaning for later labourers quite equal, I should imagine, to the harvest which the earlier have gathered in. Thus, under 'furlong,' I would not despise such a passage as the following: "A *furlong* comes next to be considered, so called *quasi furrow-long*, being so much as a team in England plougheth going forward, before they return back again."³ Once more—we are all aware why the 'wallnut' is so called; still under the word this passage, again from Fuller, might fitly be cited: "Some difficulty there is in cracking the name thereof. Why *wallnuts*, having no affinity to a wall, whose substantial trees need to borrow nothing thence for their support. . . . The truth is, Gual or Wall to the old Dutch signifieth strange or exotic (whence Welsh, that is, foreigners), these nuts being no natives of England or

¹ "God needs not our *negotiousness*, or double diligence, to bring his matters to pass."—*Id. ib.* 606.

² *Preface to the Dissertation upon Phalaris*, p. liv.

³ FULLER, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, pt. I, b. I, c. 13.

Europe, and probably first fetched from Persia, because called *Nux Persique* in the French tongue.”¹ This quotation from Raleigh² explains the true meaning of ‘forlorn hope’ better and more accurately than any which our Dictionaries supply: “His darters and slingers of the Baleares he [Hannibal] sent off before him to encounter with the Roman velites. These were loose troops, answerable in a manner to those which we call now by a French name, *enfans perdues*, but when we use our own terms, the forlorn hope.” Richardson has an excellent collection of passages tracing the relation between ‘dunce’ and Duns Scotus, and the descent of the former from the latter; yet one from Stanyhurst³ might be profitably added to them.

‘Aureola,’ though adopted at an early day into the language, and a word familiar to our old divines, is not in any of our Dictionaries. Let us, however, suppose it there, and it is evident that the following citation from Donne should accompany it: “Because in their translation, in the Vulgate edition of the Roman Church, they [the Roman Catholics] find in Exodus xxv. 25, that word *aureolam*, *Facies coronam aureolam*, Thou shalt make a lesser crown of gold, out of this diminutive and mistaken word they have established a doctrine that, besides those coronæ aureæ, those crowns of gold, which are communicated to all the saints from the crown of Christ, some saints have made to themselves and produced out of their own extraordinary merits certain *aureolaes*, certain lesser crowns of their own. . . . And these *aureolaes* they ascribe only to three sorts of persons, to Virgins, to Martyrs, to Doctors.”⁴

¹ *Worthies of England, Surrey.*

² *History of the World*, b. 5, c. 3.

³ Quoted in my *Select Glossary*, s. v. *trivial*.

⁴ *Sermon 73*.—Let me here observe, as a curious phenomenon of French scholarship, and an evidence that such a quotation as this would not be superfluous, that Didron, in his really valuable book, *Iconographie Chrétienne*, p. 109, makes ‘aureola’ a diminutive of ‘aura,’ a

γ. Where the subject matter is abstruse, or in any way difficult, I would fain see all quotations made which contain happy definitions or explanations. Here, too, not as implying that very much has not been done, but simply as showing by a few examples how much remains to be done, I bring forward the following. Richardson, under 'instinct,' has a rather poor definition of it from Beattie. Where, as in this case, a better is producible, it should clearly be produced. This from Henry More appears to me a manifest improvement on that which Beattie has given: "That there is such a thing therefore as *instinct* in brute animals, I think is very plain; that is to say, that there is an instigation or impetus in them to do such things without counsel, deliberation, or acquired knowledge, as according to our reason and best consultation, we cannot but approve to be fittest to be done. Which principle in general Scaliger seems to parallel to divine inspiration. *Instinetus dicitur a Naturâ, sicut a Diis afflatus.*"¹

Richardson has only one quotation of a few lines from Hobbes, to illustrate 'common sense' (the others have none), a well-selected passage, if it had occupied a second or third place; but, as the primary and only, failing to place the key to the true meaning of the word in the hands of the ordinary reader, who, if he thinks about the matter at all, almost inevitably assumes that 'common sense' is so called as being the sense *common to all men* who are not below the average intellect of mankind. Suppose this (it is again from Henry More) had also found place; it seems to me to tell, which that other does not, the story of the word: "That there is some particular or restrained seat of the *common sense* is an opinion that even all philosophers and

breath, this 'aureola' being so called, as he informs us, from its airy, wavy character; not to say that he is otherwise singularly astray on what the 'aureola' in Christian Art is, and what are its relations to the 'nimbus.'

¹ *Immortality of the Soul*, b. 3, c. 13.

physicians are agreed upon. And it is an ordinary comparison amongst them, that the external senses and the *common sense* considered together are like a circle with five lines drawn from the circumference to the centre. Wherefore, as it has been obvious for them to find out particular organs for the external senses, so they have also attempted to assign some distinct part of the body to be an organ of the *common sense*; that is to say, as they discovered sight to be seated in the eye, hearing in the ear, smelling in the nose, &c., so they conceived that there is some part of the body wherein seeing, hearing, and all other perceptions meet together, as the lines of a circle in the centre, and that there the soul does also judge and discern of the difference of the objects of the outward senses.”¹

Let me instance one more example of what I would fain see done. Here is the word ‘goodnature.’ Johnson and Richardson take no notice of it; Todd defines it thus: “Kindness, habitual benevolence, the most pleasing quality that a man or woman can possess.” It is well known to every English scholar, certainly to every theological scholar, that by ‘goodnature’ our great divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries meant something quite different from this; that the word played not an unimportant part in their statements of the relations between nature and grace; they including in it everything which it is possible for a man to have without having the grace of God; very much the *εὐφυΐα* of Aristotle, the genial preparedness for the reception of every high teaching. Suppose then that instead of the silence of Johnson and Richardson, and the weak babble of Todd, two or three such quotations as these had been appended to the word, the gain would have been considerable; and first, this from Jeremy Taylor: “*Good nature*, being the relics and remains of that shipwreck which Adam made, is the proper and immediate disposition to

¹ *Ib. b. 2, c. 7.*

holiness. When *good nature* is heightened by the grace of God, that which was natural becomes now spiritual.”¹ But take in further explanation of ‘good nature’ this from Bishop Sanderson: “*Good nature!* alas, where is it? since Adam fell, there was never any such thing in *rerum naturâ*; if there be any good thing in any man, it is all from grace. That thing which we use to call *good nature* is indeed but a subordinate means or instrument whereby God restraineth some men more than others from their birth and special constitution from sundry outrageous exorbitances, and so is a branch of this restraining grace whereof we now speak.”²

VII. Our Dictionaries err in redundancy as well as defect. A Dictionary ought to know its own limits, not merely as to what it should include, but also what it should exclude. The fault may be as great of carelessly taking in foreign and extraneous matter, as of unduly rejecting that which properly belongs to it. Our early lexicographers, I mean those who preceded Johnson, from failing to recognize any proper limits to their work, from the desire to combine in it as many utilities as possible, present often the strangest medleys in the books which they have produced. These are not Dictionaries of words only, but of persons, places, things; they are gazetteers, mythologies, scientific encyclopedias, and a hundred things more; all, of course, most imperfectly, even according to the standard of knowledge of their own time, and with a selection utterly capricious of what they admit, and what they exclude. Nor can it be said that we have yet wholly overlived this error; some of the Dictionaries in authority among us are deeply tainted with it, and none are wholly unaffected by it. The subject is one which I am unwilling

¹ *Sermon preached at the Funeral of Sir John Dalstone.*

² *Sermons*, vol. 1, p. 279.

to pass wholly by. It may seem, indeed, hardly included in my argument, which being the *deficiencies* of our English Dictionaries, undertakes to deal with the *too little* in them rather than the *too much*. Still, as I have asked that they should open their doors wide to receive a large company of words which hitherto they have declined or neglected to entertain, not to speak of other charges which I have sought to put upon them, it will hardly be out of place to show in what way room may be made for these incomers into their rightful inheritance, namely, by the expulsion of others who are mere intruders and interlopers. Were it necessary that our Dictionaries should grow very considerably in bulk, through the taking in of much which hitherto they have not taken in, I should acquiesce in the necessity, even while I regretted the inconvenience. But, in regard of most of them, there is no such necessity. Let them throw overboard that which never had any claim to make part of their cargo, and they will find room enough for the more precious wares which they are specially chartered to convey.

The most mischievous shape which this error assumes, consists in the drafting into the Dictionary a whole army of purely technical words ; such as, indeed, are not for the most part, except by an abuse of language, words at all, but signs ; having been deliberately invented as the nomenclature, and, so to speak, the algebraic notation of some special art or science, and having never passed the threshold of this, nor mingled with the general family of words. It is not unfrequently a barren ostentation which induces the bringing in of these, that so there may be grounds for boasting of an immense addition made to the vocabulary. Such additions are very cheaply made. Nothing is easier than to turn to modern treatises on chemistry or electricity, or on some other of the sciences which hardly or not at all existed half a century ago, or which, if they existed, have yet been in later times wholly

new-named—as botany, for example,—and to transplant new terms from these by the hundred and the thousand, with which to crowd and deform the pages of a Dictionary; and then to boast of the vast increase of words which it has gained over its predecessors. The labour is little more than that of transcription, but the gain is nought. It is indeed, less than nought; for it is not merely that half a dozen genuine English words recovered from our old authors would be a greater gain, a more real advance toward the completion of our vocabulary than a hundred or a thousand of these; but additions of this kind are mere disfigurements of the work which they profess to complete. Let such be reserved for a technological lexicon by themselves; such a supplement to the Dictionary of the Academy has lately been published in France: but in a Dictionary of the language they are a mere incumbrance, troubling the idea of the book, occupying precious room to which they have no manner of claim, and which will be abundantly needed for that which has.

It must be confessed that Johnson offends often and greatly in this point. There is hardly a page in his Dictionary where some word does not occur which has no business there. What has an English Dictionary to do with grammatical terms such as ‘zeugma,’ ‘polysyndeton;’ with rhetorical, ‘auxesis;’ with medical, ‘ægilops,’ ‘parotis,’ ‘ecphracticks,’ ‘meliceris,’ ‘steatoma,’ ‘striatura,’ ‘atheroma;’ with zoological, ‘lamellated,’ ‘striæ;’ with architectural, ‘zocle,’ ‘pentastyle;’ with botanical, ‘polypetalous,’ ‘quadriphyllous,’ ‘corymbiferous,’ ‘papilionaceous,’ ‘semiflosculous,’ ‘dorsiferous;’ with ‘acroteria,’ ‘alectryomancy,’ ‘elaterium,’ ‘orthodromics,’ and, I doubt not, one or two thousand more which might easily be culled from his pages? all, in their places very good, quite needing that they should both be registered and explained; but not in their places here. And then, as though these were not enough, Todd has thought it needful to add largely to their number;

while Webster has far outdone both. His Dictionary, while it is scanty of the barest necessities which such a work ought to possess, affords in about a page and a half the following choice additions to the English language:—‘zeolitiform,’ ‘zinkiferous,’ ‘zinky,’ ‘zoophytological,’ ‘zumosimeter,’ ‘zygodactulous,’ ‘zygomatic,’ with some twenty more. I am reminded here of the hearty protest of a writer in the seventeenth century against the favour shown to these hideous exotics, coupled with the neglect of so much which has sprung from, and is racy of, our own soil. “It will,” he exclaims, “well become those of us who have a more hearty love for what is our own than wanton longings after what is others’, to fetch back some of our own words that have been jostled out in wrong, that worse from elsewhere might be hoisted in; or else to call in from the fields and waters, shops and workhousen, that well fraught world of words that answers works, by which all learners are taught to do, and not to make a clatter. . . . Methinks this of all times should be the time wherein, if ever, we should gather up those scattered words of ours that speak works, rather than to suck in those of learned air from beyond the sea, which are as far off sometimes from the things they speak, as they are from us to whom they are spoken.”¹

It is a notable merit in Richardson, that he has thrown overboard far the greater part of this rubbish, for rubbish in this place it has a right to be called. Still, even he does not draw rigidly enough the line of demarcation between words which belong to common English, and to special arts and sciences; between catholic and sectarian words. What, we may ask, does an English Dictionary want with ‘tophaceous,’ with ‘œdematous,’ ‘phagedenick,’ and the numerous words which he supports by citations

¹ FAIRFAX, *Bulk and Selvedge of the World.* 1674. *To the Reader.*

from Wiseman's *Surgery*? In almost every case these are superfluous, and worse than superfluous.

But are, it may be asked, no scientific words to find place in a Dictionary? The answer is easy. None but those which come under the two following heads. Those, first, which have passed out of their peculiar province into more or less general use. In every branch of human study there are a certain number of these; which have become, so to speak, the heritage of all intelligent men, whether they have been initiated into that special study or no. It will, of course, not always be easy to say exactly what these are, to draw the line which separates them from the abstruser terms of a science; and no two lexicographers can be expected to draw the line so as exactly to include and exclude the same words; yet this seems to me a sufficiently guiding principle in the adoption or rejection of these terms. Thus 'paronomasia' has plainly a right to a place, 'autonomasia' has none. Then, secondly, such technical and scientific words as, although they have not thus past into more or less general use, or at least general understanding, are scattered up and down our literature; I use *literature* here not in the sense of good books as distinguished from bad, but in its proper antithesis to *science*. Thus if Burton uses 'elegm,' and Jeremy Taylor 'spagyrist,' these words must be admitted into the Dictionary. The mischievous error lies in swamping it with words which it is necessary to go to seek in treatises on special arts and sciences, and which have never travelled beyond these.

And as an English Dictionary ought not to include the technical words of different sciences, as little ought it to attempt to supply the place of popular treatises on the different branches of human knowledge; it must everywhere know how to preserve the line firm and distinct between itself and an encyclopedia. Let the quotations yield as much information as they can be made to yield, in subordination to their primary purpose, which is, to illustrate the *word*, and

not to tell us about the *thing*; and in the due and happy selection of these, so as, if possible, to combine both objects, the lexicographer may display eminent skill. Nor would any one object, if under some really difficult word, these citations did not exactly observe symmetrical proportion with other citations, but somewhat exceeded.¹ But what can be more absurd than diffuse descriptions from the compiler's own pen, or from books which have no character of literature about them, of the plants, fruits, flowers, precious stones, animals, and the rest, whose names find place in his columns? It is strange that Johnson's strong common sense did not save him from falling into this error; but it has not. He might well have spared us thirteen closely printed lines on an opal, nineteen on a rose, twenty-one on the almug-tree, as many on the air-pump, not fewer on the natural history of the armadillo, and rather more than sixty on the pear. All this is repeated by Todd; and in an exaggerated form by Webster, from whom, for instance, we may learn of the camel, that it constitutes the riches of the Arabian, that it can sustain abstinence from drink for many days, and in all, twenty-five lines of its natural history. Richardson is entirely free from this fault.

Again, there is a defect of true insight into what are the proper bounds and limits of a Dictionary, in the admission into it of the innumerable family of compound epithets, such as 'cloud-capt,' 'heaven-saluting,' 'flower-enwoven,' and the like. Here, too, the rule is plain. When words have been brought into close connexion with one another, not in the choice or caprice of one writer, and on a single occasion or two or three occasions, but by the consenting use of many appear in constant alliance, being in this their

¹ I would instance the two passages in OLEARIUS' *Travels* (1669), one on 'coffee,' p. 240, and another on 'tea,' p. 241, as happy examples of this combination.

recognized juxtaposition to all intents and purposes a single word, they may then claim their admission of right. Thus we ought not to look in vain for 'hunchbacked,' 'light-headed,' 'lightfingered,' and such composite words as these. Where, on the contrary, words are not married, but only, as it were, salute one another for an instant, and then part company again, it may be for ever, it is worse than mere waste of room to make a place for them. Johnson does so; but in measure. Thus, having after 'cloud' inserted 'cloud-capt' and 'cloud-compelling,' he holds his hand; while Todd, in a sort of practical irony of his great predecessor, and showing whither the principle which he had admitted would lead, adds seven more, which owe their whole existence to a hyphen; 'cloud-ascending,' 'cloud-born,' 'cloud-eclipsed,' 'cloud-dispelling,' 'cloud-kissing,' 'cloud-topt,' 'cloud-touching,' each constituting an article by itself; and then Webster is a step still further in advance; and has, for instance, fifteen epithets into which 'heaven' enters, from 'heaven-aspiring' to 'heaven-warring,' each of these, too, an independent article; while 'heart' is a component part of thirty-three. Here is in great part an explanation of the twenty thousand words which he boasts are to be found in his pages over and above those included in the latest edition of Todd. Admitting these transient combinations as though they were really new words, it would have been easy to have increased his twenty thousand by twenty thousand more. Richardson very properly excludes all these; if he errs, it is perhaps in the opposite extreme, in neglecting some true and permanent coalitions.

If it be argued here that by the rejection or expulsion of these we should lose some eminent beauties and felicities of the language, which have embodied themselves in these combinations, and which deserve to be recorded, the answer is easy. In the first place, even if it were necessary to do so, they must still go, if they have no proper place in the

work in hand. But it is not needful. Such of these epithets as are worth preserving may easily be preserved and incorporated in the book by a quotation of the passage in which they occur, under one or other of the words of which they are composed; or, better still, under that of the person or thing to which they are applied. He who would not lose sight of Shakespeare's '*heavy-gaited* toad,' or Sylvester's '*opal-coloured* morn,' or Marlowe's '*golden-fingered* Ind,' or Drayton's '*silver-sanded* shore,'¹ or those glorious compound epithets with which Milton so much abounds, would have two or three opportunities of introducing them into his Dictionary.

A few words in conclusion, and with reference which I once more desire to make to the work which we ourselves have in hand. Some shortcomings have been pointed out in our Dictionaries, and though, taking them in all, they cannot be said to be few, yet the books from which they are chiefly drawn, as you will not have failed to observe, are comparatively few; and even these books are capable of yielding infinitely more in this kind than they have here yielded. It is easy, then, to guess how much must remain behind. Indeed, how should there not? For let us only consider the range and extent of this noble and marvellous literature of England, the number of books which compose it; and how is it possible for any single scholar, even with a large portion of his lifetime devoted to this one object, to bring within his own ken more than a very small proportion of these? There are some single authors who would abundantly serve as a task of toil for a year, and that to the most industrious student. I am persuaded there are very few who

¹ It is very characteristic of the incompleteness which must attend every attempt to gather this innumerable army of compound epithets into a Dictionary, that not one of these four here named is to be found in Johnson, Todd, or Webster.

would work through Holland's seven folios, large and small, so as they deserve and demand to be worked through for philological purposes, in a shorter time. The three folio volumes of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* would certainly of themselves occupy many months. What is the consequence of this enormous disproportion between the work to be done and the working power to accomplish it? The compiler of a Dictionary, hopeless to find himself in possession of the whole treasure in some books, of whose value he is yet too well aware to leave them altogether untouched, dips into them here and there; often with signal advantage to his work, but still not in this fulfilling the demands which the ideal Dictionary that floats before our eyes would make on its compilers. Thus Dr. Johnson, with characteristic truthfulness, tells us how he was compelled to supply the manifest deficiencies in the labours of those who went before him "by fortuitous and unguided excursions into books, gleaning as industry should find, or chance should direct;" and congratulates himself on the success which attended these desultory forays. But it is evident that if by these much is brought away, very much more must be left behind; nor can such irregular efforts ever yield that *Lexicon totius Anglicitatis* which we justly desire.

I seem to myself to trace clearest evidences of this random reading in the great work which Johnson has produced. Thus he quotes, not altogether unseldom, a work to which I have frequently referred, I mean Hacket's *Life of Archbishop Williams*; yet it is quite impossible that he could have read it through, or nearly through; for the book literally swarms with words which ought to find, but never have found, their place in a Dictionary. It is, indeed, a most curious medley in diction, singularly combining the two extremes of English; being full on the one side of scholarly, oftentimes pedantic, Grecisms, as 'scleragogy,'¹ a

¹ "Not our Reformation, but our slothfulness, doth indispose us, that

word used by ascetics to express a severe handling of the body; 'hecatontarchy'; Latinisms, such as 'consciuncle'¹ 'solertiousness,'² with a few Italianisms to boot; 'bugiard'³ = liar, and 'amorevolous,'⁴ are examples in this kind; and on the other side, abounding with our most genuine Anglo-Saxon phrase; such words as 'may-lord,'⁵ 'goll-sheaves,'⁶ which one meets in no glossary or Dictionary (the last I only guess at the meaning of), with a vast number more of the same kind are to be found in his pages, but not one of them in Johnson, nor, as far as I can note, in our other Dictionaries.

Something of the same sort I observe in Richardson. He has drawn, as he justly makes his boast in his *Preface*, a large number of books within the circle of his reading, which had never been employed for lexicographical purposes before; and the virgin soil which he has tilled has often yielded him rich and large returns. Yet it lies in the necessity of things, in the limited capacities of any single man, that of the works which he uses, some, and those important ones, can have only been partially read. In a very small matter I find a curious evidence of this; in the

we let others run faster than we, in temperance, in chastity, in *scleragogy*, as it was called."—Pt. 2, p. 51.

¹ "Their rubrics are filled with punctilios, not for consciences, but *consciuncles*."—Pt. 1, p. 66.

² "Which abounded to the praise of Mr. Williams's *solertiousness*."—Pt. 1, p. 22.

³ "Like an egregious *bugiard*, he is here quite out of the truth."—Pt. 1, p. 71.

⁴ "He would leave it the Princessa to show her cordial and *amorevolous* affections."—Pt. 1, p. 161.

⁵ "Not only such corrupt ones must needs decline faster than they got up, but the most circumspect who possess such a room as they did, will prove to be *May-lords* in Fortune's interlude."—Pt. 1, p. 40.

⁶ "All the rest of the articles [*i.e.*, of accusation] were *goll-sheaves*, that went out in a sudden blaze."—Pt. 2, p. 92.

fact, namely, that he shares the impression of those who have gone before him, of Johnson and Nares, that the verb 'to dade,' signifying to lead as one leads a child by the hand, is only to be found in Drayton. Indeed, he puts more emphasis into the assertion than any of his predecessors—"a word," he says, "peculiar to Drayton"—a fact, *prima facie*, very unlikely, belonging, as it evidently does, to the old stock of the language; but singularly enough, he actually quotes in another part of his Dictionary, (s. v. 'runt'), some words of Holland's, which, if he had read three lines further, would have shown him that at least one other, as well as Drayton, employed 'to dade.'¹

Let me again say that these observations are not made in any spirit of detraction from works of immense and conscientious labour, but only as pointing out what cannot but continually be, while art is so long, and life so short. And having touched on this theme, I will take the opportunity of noting, in direct connexion with our subject, a serious omission on the part of many recent editors of our older authors, and one which must greatly diminish the worth of their labours; this, namely, that they have failed to append to their editions a glossary of the rare and remarkable words which the works may contain, with a reference to the page where they occur.² I add this last clause, superfluous as it may seem; because in some of the

¹ "A man of years, who is a politician, must offer himself lovingly unto those that make toward him, and be glad to sort and converse with them; such he ought to inform, to correct, *to dade* and lead by the hand."—*Plutarch*, p. 399.

² Let me further say that the glossary should be apart, in an index by itself, not dispersed through the general index; in which case it becomes much more laborious to use. Even those among the Parker Society's publications, which, as regards the glossary, are edited carefully and well, Becon for instance, lie under this fault. The admirable glossary which Dr. Jacobson has appended to his edition of the Works of Bishop Sanderson fulfils all the conditions which one could desire.

publications of the Parker Society, as, for instance, in the writings of Coverdale and Hutchinson, the provoking and tantalizing absurdity is committed of giving the rare words, or the words used in unusual senses, but without a reference to enable the reader to discover the place where they occur. It is the same with the works of Bishop Hall, edited some thirty years ago by one bearing his own name. What student of English would not give much to have an effective glossary of all the vigorous English which the twelve volumes of his works contain—covering as they do a space of time larger perhaps than those of any other English writer; for they extend from the later years of Queen Elizabeth to the earlier of the Commonwealth. But there, too, is a glossary without references, one, therefore, which is practically worthless. In glancing my eye over it, I saw various words, which, for one reason or another, I would most gladly have turned to. Useful, however, as the information might have been to me, life was not long enough for the perusal of twelve thick volumes to obtain this information, which, therefore, I was compelled to forego. To those who, in the act of editing, have become familiar with every page of a book, who must have gone over it innumerable times, the labour of preparing such an index would be literally nothing; while the treasures which they would thus place at the disposal of the student of English philology, treasures which he could only otherwise make his own by enormous labour, and labour which in most cases it is quite impossible for him to bestow, would be invaluable. Certainly, when one compares the way in which the classical works of Greece and Rome are edited with the slight and perfunctory editing of many among our own, the contrast does little honour to our zeal for our native tongue. There might well be a general consent among scholars to consider no book of our earlier literature as decently edited, no editor as having tolerably fulfilled the

obligations which, as such, he undertook, where such a glossary as I speak of is wanting.

It is certain, however, of a vast number of our books, that they will never be reprinted, that the facility of entrance into their philological treasures which good indexes might give will never be afforded. Add to these all those other works just noted, which have lately been insufficiently edited, with no verbal indexes, or with bad ones, and for which the opportunity will certainly not soon occur of repairing these omissions, and we have a mass of English literature, which can only be made available for philological purposes through the combined action of many; a dense and serried phalanx of books which the desultory and isolated assaults of one here and one there can never hope effectually to penetrate. Nor may we console ourselves with the assumption that even though the maker of a Dictionary may be obliged to leave a multitude of these books untouched, or at any rate unsearched, still that a far smaller number diligently worked through will give him the whole body of the English tongue, that, after all, other books could only repeat what has been already found in these. Such an assumption would be altogether a mistaken one. It is surprising how excessively rare some words are, and these not merely the arbitrary creations of single authors, and to be met only in their writings, but such as belong to the old stock of the language. At all times there has been a certain small body of well-worn words—small, that is, as compared with the whole vocabulary—that have done nearly the whole work of the language, and have constituted in the main our written, as a still smaller body constitutes, our spoken language. One may read for years in our old literature, and not light, it may be, during the whole time on some word which, being found, at once testifies for itself, that, however rare in books, it must have been common in speech; and having lighted on it once, we may never encounter it a second time. If, there-

fore, we count it worth while to have all words, we can only have them by reading all books; this is the price which we must be content to pay.

But how, it may naturally be asked, shall all books be read? In that most interesting preface which Jacob Grimm has prefixed to his own and his brother's German Dictionary, he makes grateful and honourable mention of no less than eighty-three volunteer coadjutors, who had undertaken each to read for him one or more authors, and who had thrown into the common stock of his great work their several 'symbols,' the results of their several toils; while he expresses a confident hope that, as the work proceeds, he will enlist many more of these helpers. It is something of this common action which the Philological Society has suggested to its members. It entertained, also, from the first a hope, in which it has not been disappointed, that many besides its own members would gladly divide with them the toil and honour of such an undertaking.

Only thus can we hope that this work will ever be effectually done, that we shall ever obtain that complete inventory of our English tongue, with other accessory advantages, which we ought not to rest satisfied until we possess. The story in Herodotus is probably familiar to us all of the course which the Persians followed, when they proposed to make entire clearance of the inhabitants of some conquered island, to bring them all within their grasp. An entire army would join hand in hand till it covered the breadth of the island, and would then in this fashion pass over it from end to end, rendering it impossible that so much as one of those whom they desired to seize should escape. This *σαγηνεύειν*, this drawing as with a sweep-net over the whole extent of English literature, is that which we would fain see; which we would count it an honour to be the means of organizing and setting forward;

being sure that it is only by such combined action, by such a joining of hand in hand on the part of as many as are willing to take their share in this toil, that we can hope the innumerable words which have escaped us hitherto, which are lurking unnoticed in every corner of our literature, will ever be brought within our net, that an English Dictionary will prove that all-embracing *πάναγρον* which, indeed, it should be.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 11, note 1, for 'tutivillus' read 'Tutivillus.'

Page 13, note 4, add as a second quotation the following :—

"If having received this seal [of God] upon us, we so far forget ourselves as to let his *æmulus*, the fiend, the evil spirit, to set his mark over it, seal upon seal, this is so foul a disgrace as He can never brook it."—ANDREWS, *Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost*, Sermon VI.

Page 26, note 1, for 'Glossary' read 'Glossarial Index.'

Page 38, last line of text, after the words "far off." add :

'Encyclopædia' could not have yet existed, at the time when Ben Jonson in his *Discoveries* spoke of "the knowledge of the liberal arts, which the Greeks called ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία."

Page 51, line 15, after the words "the scenes, &c." add :—

An observation of Wotton's marks the novelty of the word 'character.' It occurs in his *Survey of Education*, which may have been written about 1625. "Now, here then," he says, "will lie the whole business, to set down beforehand certain signatures, or *characters*, as I will call them (because that word hath gotten already some entertainment among us.)"

APPENDIX.

A LETTER

TO

THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER,

FROM

HERBERT COLERIDGE, Esq.

(EDITOR OF THE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL PORTION OF THE PHILOLOGICAL
SOCIETY'S NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY.)

10, Chester-place, Regent's-park,
May 30th, 1860.

MY DEAR MR. DEAN,—

As a new edition of your essay *On Some Deficiencies in our English Dictionaries* is about to appear, I wish to take this opportunity of laying before you some details relative to the scheme of a New Dictionary projected by the Philological Society, with reference to which your essay was originally written. I shall forego all description of the merely mechanical arrangements which have been adopted and brought at length into working order; all necessary information on that head will be found in our printed *Proposal*¹ and the Canons hereafter referred to: my object on the present occasion is simply to state *results*, as it is by them alone that the public can be enabled to judge of the probable success of the scheme and of its claims to support. For the sake, however, of those to whom the scheme may be altogether new, it may be as well to state that the raw materials for the work—*i.e.*, the words and authorities—are being brought together by the voluntary and independent

¹ *Proposal for the Publication of a New English Dictionary by the Philological Society.* London: Trübner and Co. 1859. Price 6d.

labours of numerous individuals, all working on a common plan, according to certain definite and prescribed rules, and that the theory of lexicography we profess is that which Passow was the first to enunciate clearly and put in practice successfully—viz., “that every word should be made to tell its own story”—the story of its birth and life, and in many cases of its death, and even occasionally of its resuscitation.

It would be a waste of time to recount the history of our early attempts and failures. More than a year passed away in combating various difficulties, and it was not till August, 1858, that we felt ourselves in a position to announce the plan of a New Dictionary as a certainty, and to invite contributors to furnish us with assistance. A new and much-enlarged prospectus was shortly afterwards brought out, which has recently passed through a second edition, and many additions might now be made even to this. The details which I am about to give relate to what has been effected in this interval of rather less than two years. I shall first exhibit the state of our forces, and then proceed to an account of their achievements.

I ought, however, *in limine*, to say that the title under which we have hitherto been accustomed to announce our book—viz., that of an *English* Dictionary—is one no longer strictly applicable. During last year, several offers of assistance came in from the other side of the Atlantic, where our Proposal appears to have created some little sensation, and a wish was expressed that Americans should be allowed to take part in the work. This co-operation presented too many obvious advantages to allow us to hesitate for a moment with regard to its acceptance, and the Hon. G. P. Marsh, of Burlington, Vermont, having kindly offered to act as secretary in America, I at once suggested that the Americans should make themselves responsible for the whole of the eighteenth century literature, which probably would have a less chance of finding as many readers in England. This was agreed to, and an abridged edition of our Proposal has been issued there, and contributors are, as I understand, coming in, but no results of their labours have reached me as yet.

A. CONTRIBUTORS.

The number of contributors at the present time, exclusive of the Americans and three others who have died, is 147. Certain deductions must, however, be made from this total, in order to ascertain the efficient working staff. In the first place, forty-three contributors may be looked upon as "functi officio;" they have fulfilled their promises, sent in their work, and so terminated their temporary connexion with the scheme; fifteen more I set down as "hopeless;" most of these consist of contributors who volunteered to aid us under our first scheme, and have since either forgotten their promises, or found the task more irksome than they anticipated, and so thrown it aside, remaining deaf to all applications made to them on the subject. The loss is not very important, as in most cases the works undertaken by this faithless band are of secondary value; and in some instances I have succeeded in substituting fresh contributors in their places. This brings the number of actually operative hands down to eighty-nine. These I again divide into three classes. Class I., numbering thirty, consists of none but first-rate contributors, who do all they do conscientiously and well, and leave nothing to be desired in any respect. These men work with a thorough and intelligent appreciation of the nature of the scheme, and constitute its main support, and to their untiring efforts and labour of love will be due in a great measure such success as we may achieve. Class II. contains fifteen more of inferior merit, and Class III., amounting to the large number of forty-four, embraces all those who have not as yet sent in any work, and whose merits it is consequently impossible accurately to judge of at present.

The foregoing details may be looked upon, I think, as giving us as much encouragement as we could fairly expect. At the lowest calculation we have fifty efficient contributors at work—a number quite sufficient to do all that yet remains to be done, were they only located in positions where their energies could be employed to the greatest effect. Unfortunately, however, British Museums and Bodleians are not dotted over the land like circulating libraries, and consequently much of the material which is of primary importance to us is rendered, to all intents

and purposes, inaccessible. However, even as it is, our scheme will bear favourable comparison with that of the Grimms, which is now being carried on in Germany in a manner somewhat similar to our own. In their preface, these two great philologists, whose names command universal respect and attention, are constrained to confess, that out of eighty-three contributors (and those contributors, be it remarked, Germans) only *six* could be considered as satisfactory, and that only *one* of these *six*—the one who undertook Goethe's works—had entirely come up to their beau ideal of a contributor.

B. WORK.

In the First Period there have been at present undertaken about 139 of the various works and pieces given in our list.¹ Of these I have received 64, leaving 75 still to be delivered. Among these last are the whole of the thirteenth century pieces included in my Glossarial Index, none of which have as yet been transcribed for use; and many of the heavier romances, printed by the Roxburghe and Abbotsford Clubs. Nearly all the important works of this period have, however, been undertaken, the few exceptions being Syr Gawayne, Barclay's Works, several of Caxton's publications, the two poems entitled *Morte d'Arthur*, edited by Halliwell, and for the Roxburghe Club respectively; and Trevisa's translation of the *Polycronicon*, which, I am glad to see, is to form part of the series now publishing under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls.²

Second Period.—The total number of books of this period undertaken is about 276, reckoning the various treatises of each author together, although they may be in the hands of several

¹ *Proposal*, pp. 17-24.

² I cannot help taking this opportunity of expressing my great regret, that the claims of two such authors as Robert of Gloucester and Robert Brunne, to a place in this series should have been overlooked. Their chronicles are important as philological no less than as historical monuments, and a new edition of Robert of Gloucester, based on the Cottonian MS., instead of the later and inferior Harleian MS. which Hearne was compelled to use, would form a most attractive volume. Now that the scheme is no longer confined to unprinted works, it is to be hoped that these authors will receive the consideration which they most eminently deserve.

contributors. In the case, however, of translators—such as Holland—I have reckoned each translation as a separate book; and have followed the same rule in respect to such writers as Tyndale and Coverdale, who were authors as well as translators. Of these I have received rather more than half; but several of the works included in this aggregate are only at present partially analyzed, and await completion; while others, having been read merely with a view of extracting what our predecessors had passed over, can hardly be said to have been analyzed at all.

Third Period.—Of this period the report I have to make will be but brief. America, as I have already stated, has made herself responsible for the literature of the eighteenth century; but of course nothing can be said at present as to the results of this arrangement. In England, little in a direct way has as yet been done; indirectly, as I shall show presently, we have got a good deal of matter together available for our more immediate wants. Much of this indifference to the modern literature on the part of contributors is no doubt owing to the fact that the basis of comparison for this period has not as yet been issued; the construction of which I have found it necessary to undertake myself, and which I hope to be in a position to send to press in about a couple of months from the present date. The appearance of this list will no doubt expedite matters considerably; but, meanwhile, in order to economize time, I proposed, and the Society sanctioned, the adoption of the following scheme. A list of our deficiencies (in letter A.) was printed on a quarto sheet in triple columns just before the long vacation, and circulated among members and contributors; it contained as nearly as possible 1000 words, and such has been the success of this appeal to public sympathy, that barely 300 words now remain without quotations from one period or the other; and I confidently expect to clear off the whole before the end of the present year.

In what precedes I have given you the complete statistics of the Dictionary, as far as I am acquainted with them myself; and my letter might close appropriately enough here, were it not for one or two matters which I think should not be withheld in a communication of this nature. Among these subjects,

the first in order of time, and certainly in importance as to the future fortunes of the Dictionary, is the determination that has been arrived at by the Council of the Society respecting the editorship of the work, a matter which was pressed upon us from time to time in various criticisms and reviews of our scheme, and which, even on personal grounds, I felt was one which urgently required the speediest settlement possible. As soon, therefore, as the Society's meetings recommenced, in November last, I laid before the members at the earliest opportunity a report, containing much of the statistical information I have given you in the former part of this letter; and I then took occasion to point out that my position was rapidly becoming an unpleasantly equivocal one—that, as the working member of the committee, I was not unnaturally looked upon and treated by contributors as the editor *de facto*; and that, in consequence, I was gradually and involuntarily becoming saddled with more than the ordinary responsibilities, without any of the ordinary powers, of an editor *de jure*. I was frequently called upon to decide questions which no one but an accredited editor ought to have pronounced upon, and which it was not only possible, but exceedingly probable, that such editor, when actually chosen, would decide in an entirely different manner. These representations were allowed to have weight, and the result was, that the Society, *magnas inter opes inops*, I fear, in one sense, when I recal the names of many whose knowledge and experience would have given them far stronger claims to such a post, but for the pressure of other avocations and separate lines of study, shortly afterwards, in the kindest and most flattering manner, assigned to myself the editorial superintendence of the literary and historical portion of the work; that relating to the etymology being for the present left in abeyance, on account of various difficulties of detail, into which I need not here enter. Probably it will be found that this department—unlike the other, where a single head is essential—can be better worked by a small committee than by any one individual. The difference lies in the very nature of the subject, of which a single scholar, however profound, can only grasp thoroughly a portion, and would, notwithstanding the most honest desire to be impartial, in the exe-

cution of his task, be inevitably biassed in favour of that particular class of languages with which his studies had rendered him most familiar.

Shortly after my appointment to the editorship, I prepared a series of rules or canons, principally intended for the settlement of various mechanical details, which it was absolutely essential to have disposed of *in limine*. These were discussed and extensively enlarged and modified by a committee of eight members of Council (including myself), at two meetings held in December and January last respectively, and with these enlargements and modifications have been finally submitted to the whole body of members. The discussion occupied three separate meetings, and has resulted in the introduction of very considerable alterations into the original draft—all, I may say, in an expansive direction. These canons, as thus amended, will be shortly reprinted and published, and will then present a complete view of our scheme; but of course the principles and reasonings upon which it depends for its justification must be reserved for the prolegomena of the work itself. I do not feel that it would be proper for me in this place to enter into a criticism of these changes, with respect to which very various opinions may be, and certainly will be, formed: I am glad, however, to be able still to say that all the essential features of your scheme have been preserved, and that while much has been added, nothing has been introduced which contravenes the positions of the *Essay*, except in one instance of comparatively slight importance. And the accretions themselves that are to find their way into the book are so disposed of as not to interfere in any way with the main arrangement, excepting only the single case to which I have alluded.

I have now brought my narrative down to the present time, and may terminate this already, I fear, too long letter. I believe that the scheme is now firmly established, and is so regarded by the public, and I confidently expect, unless any unforeseen accident should occur to paralyze our efforts, that in about two years we shall be able to give our first number to the world. Indeed, were it not for the dilatoriness of many contributors, who promise anything and everything, but postpone performance indefinitely, neither assisting us themselves, nor

